DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 314 EA 019 998

AUTHOR	Glass, Thomas E., Ed.
TITLE	An Analysis of Texts on School Administration 1820-1985. (The Reciprocal Relationship between the Literature and the Profession).
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-8134-2639-1
PUB DATE	86
NOTE	141p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publication Sales, The Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc., 19 N. Jackson St., P.O. Box 50, Danville, IL 61834-0050 ($7.95 less 10% educational discount on single copy; 20% educational discount on quantity orders).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Principles; *Administrator Education; *Educational History; Educational Objectives; *Educational Philosophy; Educational Principles; Educational Psychology; Educational Sociology; Educational Theories; Elementary Secondary Education; Ideology; Models; *Textbook Content; Textbooks

ABSTRACT

This book, consisting of articles by separate authors, traces the historical and ideological development of textbooks in educational administration through five separate phases. "From Idea to Ideology: School Administration Texts 1820-1914" by Robert Mason analyzes 19th Century perspectives on school administration based on texts from that time, showing how the ideas informing school organization reflected the moral idealism affirmed by the established society of the time. "From Ideology to Conventional Wisdom: School Administration Texts 1915-1933" by William Eaton continues this analysis, showing how the ideas of Ellwood P. Cubberley dominated the field of educational administration at this time. "From Conventional Wisdom to Concept: School Administration Texts 1934-1945" by James C. Parker shows how educational administration textbook writers during this period sought to interpret and apply two opposing educational philosophies: the school as the agency of society and the school as the pioneer of society. In "A Return to Rhetoric: School Administration Texts 1946-1955," Fred D. Carver contends that the dominant emphases in educational administration textbooks during this period were democratic administration and community schools, and that by the end of the period, a quest for a new scientific basis for administration was apparent. In the last essay, "Factualism to Theory, Art to Science: School Administration Texts 1955-1985," Thomas E. Glass reviews the wide range of recent textbooks in administration to show a strong emphasis on theory development and the use of models and techniques from the social and behavioral sciences. The book concludes with an overview, also by Thomas E. Glass, of themes that characterize each period discussed. (TE)

ED294314

An Analysis of Texts on School Administration 1820–1985

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ronald L. McDaniel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 019 998

Edited by **Thomas E. Glass**

2

An Analysis of Texts on School Administration 1820–1985

Contributors

Fred D. Carver is the Dean of the School of Education at Northern Iowa University.

William Eaton is a Professor of Educational Administration at Southern Illinois University.

Thomas E. Glass is an Associate Professor of Educational Administration at Northern Illinois University.

Robert Mason is a former Professor of Educational Administration at Southern Illinois University.

James C. Parker is an Associate Dean of the College of Education at California State University at Dominguez Hills.

An Analysis of Texts on School Administration 1820–1985

(The Reciprocal Relationship Between the Literature and the Profession)

Edited by

Thomas E. Glass

THE INTERSTATE
Printers & Publishers, Inc.
Danville, Illinois

AN ANALYSIS OF TEXTS ON SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION 1820–1985

Copyright © 1986 by The Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 86-82066

1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

ISBN 0-8134-2639-1

Preface

A body of textbook literature exists in every professional field. Textbooks have historically been the conveyors of knowledge concerning desirable practices and requisite amounts of knowledge deemed essential for functioning in specific professional roles. There is some legitimacy to calling textbooks the "bibles" of the professions. Textbooks have been a primary tool of professional socialization of new initiates into the various professions. Some professions, such as law and medicine, have developed extensive textbook literature which is seemingly renewed almost each year. Other professions which are not so empirically based develop textbook literature at a much slower pace, as professional knowledge and practice remain current for longer periods of time.

The use of textbooks in education in the United States has been a fact since the beginning of the common school, where students were early on introduced to *Pilgrim's Progress* and later *McGuffey's Readers*. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, books were expensive and difficult to obtain in many school districts and were therefore used sparingly. However, with the advent of steam-powered presses and cheaper paper, textbooks became used more in schoolrooms across the nation by the conclusion of the Civil War.

The training of individuals for the specific purpose of school administration really did not emerge as a professional enterprise until the twentieth century. Consequently, the library of textbooks on school administration was very limited until after the First World War.

The 1920's saw the emergence of the first real body of textbook literature written specifically for school administrators. Many of the authors were professors of education at major institutions such as Teachers College, Columbia University, Stanford University, and the University of

Chicago. Other authors were superintendents or had been superintendents of large urban school districts. Actually, an interlocking relationship existed between the two groups, as many of the superintendents had been graduate students of the professors. This led to the works which were fairly consistent in approach and goals. The first 30 years of the literature demonstrate a common set of theses regarding sanctity of American democracy, the Protestant work ethic, and traditional values of virtue and hard work, along with tenets of scientific management which were thought necessary for successful schools and preservation of traditional American culture.

Interestingly, textbook literature in school administration, at times, correlates in terms of approach and philosophy with other philosophical movements prevalent in the education profession and contemporary schools of organizational management. For instance, texts after the First World War seem to reflect management incorporating the theories of the "Connectionists" such as Thorndike in the classroom with the Taylor's Scientific Management Theories in the private organizational sector. Later, the human relations theories of Mary Parker Follett and others seem to be taken up by the textbook writers, many of whom were very interested in Dewey's "Progressive Education" in the classroom. So, the examination of textbook literature can sometimes be pictured in a larger framework than merely the leafing through of dozens of administrative "cookbooks." Contemporary themes of management and educational philosophy can be discovered in the texts which chronicle in some ways the history of American public education not found elsewhere, with the exception of specific works in the history of education.

The idea for this book first originated in 1978, in the faculty of the Department of Educational Administration at Southern Illinois University. It was the contention of Professor William Eaton that four distinct phases or eras of textbooks in educational administration existed prior to the dominance of the field by the behavior sciences in the middle 1950's. These four phases were later discussed with Professor James Parker, and what emerged was a proposal for paper presentations to the 1978 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) in Toronto.

The four identified phases were (1) From Idea to Ideology: School Administration Texts from 1820 to 1914, (2) From Ideology to Conventional Wisdom: School Administration Texts from 1915 to 1933, (3) From Conventional Wisdom to Concept: School Administration Texts from 1934 to 1945, and

(4) A Return to Rhetoric: School Administration Texts from 1946 to 1955. Professors Robert Mason and Fred Carver picked up the two latter topics, respectively, as their individual contributions.

The editor of this publication heard the four papers in Toronto and was very impressed, as information on textbook literature in educational administration is scarce and not often discussed except in the initial chapters of some general educational administration texts. This is usually done in a formal manner, with the author(s) explaining why previous authors and their theories of administration were mistaken, however sincere they might have been. The editor was not aware of any previous attempts to both review and analyze the trends of this literature.

The four papers reposed in a file cabinet for a number of years until a chance communication between the editor and Fred Carver led to the discussion of the possibility of adding a fifth paper treating the "era" of the behavioral sciences. This fifth paper could complete the series, which might then be called a monograph on the subject. Also, later conversations with the other authors led to the opinion that a good overall summary might strengthen the total monograph by highlighting each phase and attempting to pull together some common or significant themes. There, in fact, might be the development of some theoretical base for future research.

The editor submitted a proposal to Division A of AERA for presentation of the fifth paper and the summary of the previous four papers highlighting common themes and theses of the total epoch of textbook literature in educational administration. It seems this might be viewed as a service to the profession, as surely it is advisable for each initiate to possess an overall knowledge of what has passed on before.

Thomas E. Glass

DeKalb, Illinois
January 1986

Table of Contents

Preface v

1. From Idea to Ideology:
School Administration Texts 1820-1914

Robert Mason 1

2. From Ideology to Conventional Wisdom:
School Administration Texts 1915-1933

William Eaton 23

3. From Conventional Wisdom to Concept:
School Administration Texts 1934-1945

James C. Parker 39

4. A Return to Rhetoric:
School Administration Texts 1946-1955

Fred D. Carver 75

5. Factualism to Theory, Art to Science:
School Administration Texts 1955-1985

Thomas E. Glass 93

6. An Overview:
School Administration Texts 1820-1985

Thomas E. Glass 115

Chapter 1

From Idea to Ideology: School Administration Texts 1820–1914

Robert Mason

That school administration was recognized as a special function early in the nineteenth century is clear. New York State established the office of state superintendent of common schools in 1812, and Maryland, Illinois, Vermont, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Kentucky created similar offices before 1840. More than 20 cities had established the office of city superintendent of schools by the end of the Civil War. A national association of school superintendents was formed in 1865, this organization becoming the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association a few years later. Nevertheless, duties and prerogatives of school management remained quite diffuse and inconsistent from situation to situation, and individuals holding office as "superintendents" were not always possessed of power to manage the school affairs. Few cities designated the school superintendent as the chief executive of the board in the nineteenth century. For example, there is the statement of record outlining the duties of the superintendent of schools in Boston in 1859 (Annual Report of the School Committee of the City of Boston, 1959). Section 6 of this document obligates the superintendent of schools to "consult with the different bodies who have control of the building and altering of school houses" and "advise" concerning school appropriations and expenditures. But his functions bearing upon fiscal matters are strictly limited to "consultation," "communication," "suggestion," and "advisement."

City schools in other parts of the nation developed as they had been established in rural areas. Voters in a ward

voted to have a school; the ward became a school district, and each ward school was managed as an autonomous institution.

> . . . city school boards . . . actually functioned in a very "uncentralized" fashion prior to the urban school reforms of the late 1800's.
>
> Each city ward selected one or more representatives to run the schools, appoint the teachers and janitor, and solve local problems.[1]

In a very real sense, schools, thus managed, were people's institutions, set up, controlled, and financed by non-professionals. Teachers were hired to exercise an expertise that did not extend beyond that represented by the best-educated parents in the community. Not all persons in the community possessed the expertise of the teacher, but they were sufficiently familiar with it not to be over-awed. Thus, teachers were hired to "keep school" and "hear pupils recite" from books with which at least some of the parents were familiar. Teachers, that is, were dealing with familiar materials and skills. Thus, it also becomes understandable that school administrators were sometimes charged only with menial duties of maintenance. And, at other times, they were expected to do everything from supervising a spelling bee to fixing a leaky faucet. In general, they were most responsible for the supervision of the instructional program, and as the years went by this became the predominant way in which their time was spent. Many, many school boards hired a separate person to purchase school supplies, and to be in charge of the school facilities.[2]

As school administration became increasingly professionalized toward the end of the nineteenth century, a shift was definitely visible toward academics. School administrators worked to get more power in selecting teachers, supervising instruction, and examining pupils, releasing fiscal management to the board. Generally, before the turn of the century, administrators did not seek fiscal responsibility or power, as this was exercised directly by the board, in some instances through a full-time business manager appointed by the board or chosen in the same way the members of the board were chosen. This official frequently

outranked the superintendent by virtue of his prior appointment to the position and his prerogative to recommend to the board concerning appointment of a person to the office of superintendent. No mention is found of a converse relationship entailing either the right or obligation of an incumbent superintendent to recommend to the board concerning a vacancy in the office of business manager. He had no fiscal responsibility and no prerogatives in the management of school business. He was an officer subordinate to the business executive and through him only to the board on financial and plant management matters. He was, however, directly responsible for the academic or instructional activities--textbooks, courses of study, teaching methods, progress in course of pupils. Appointment of teachers was a moot area. However, the Committee of Fifteen[3] recommended that he be given independent power to appoint and assign from an "eligible list," and to discontinue services for cause at his discretion.

By the late nineteenth century, it was generally agreed among educators that two offices were necessary, one for the administration of business affairs, the other for instruction.

> Among educators there was almost unanimous agreement that administration should be separated into two great independent departments. . . .[4]

This was the view of most educators by the end of the century. In brief, the superintendent and not the business officer began to emerge as the chief executive officer of school districts.[5]

In 1895, the Committee of Fifteen further recommended that management of the business interests of a city school system and supervision of instruction should be formally separated. The business executive was to be elected in the same way members of the board were elected, or appointed by the board prior to the appointment of a superintendent of instruction. The superintendent of instruction, it was recommended, should be appointed by the board upon nomination by the business executive. In concert with this recommendation, the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association endorsed the "Cleveland Plan." This was that an elected school director would serve as chief

executive of the school system responsible for overall direction and business management. This elected official would select a superintendent of instruction.

Thus, only after 1900 did professional school administration become a position invested with power by virtue of the office. Earlier, school administration was a matter of assigning and guiding pupils as approved by the board, supervising teachers appointed by the board, and developing courses of study related to approved textbooks, if any. So administration and teaching were not sharply separated; schools were "kept," not really administered, and educators of vision gained whatever power they had by hard work, persuasion, and charisma, rather than by virtue of their positions. Nevertheless, a manual of practice did develop during the nineteenth century, laying the groundwork for today's profession of school administration. To inquire into the content and perspective of this manual, 10 education books published between 1829 and 1908 were examined. They are the following:

Samuel R. Hall. *Lectures on School-keeping.* Boston: Richardson, Lord, and Holbrook, 1829. Republished by Arno Press.

Samuel R. Hall. *Lectures to Female Teachers on School-keeping.* Boston: Richardson, Lord, and Holbrook, 1832. Republished by Arno Press.

David P. Page. *Theory and Practice of Teaching.* Originally published in 1847. New edition, edited and enlarged by W. H. Payne. New York and Chicago: A. S. Barnes, 1885.

William H. Payne. *Chapters on School Supervision.* Cincinnati and New York: Wilson, Hinkle and Co., 1875.

William H. Payne. *Education of Teachers.* Richmond, Va.: B. F. Johnson, 1901.

Preston W. Search. *An Ideal School.* New York: Appleton, 1901.

Samuel T. Dutton. *School Management.* First published in 1903. New York: Scribner's, 1909.

William E. Chancellor. *Our Schools: Their Administration and Supervision.* First published in 1904. Boston: Heath, 1915.

William E. Chancellor. *A Theory of Motives, Ideals, and Values in Education.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1907.

Samuel T. Dutton and David Snedden. *The Administration of Public Education in the United States.* New York: Macmillan, 1908.

Distinctions of some importance are made in the analysis to follow between Dutton's book on school management, first published in 1903, and Dutton and Snedden's text on school administration, issued in 1908. Therefore, a reference to "Dutton" is to be taken as meaning only the 1903 work, while "Dutton and "Snedden" will be used to indicate the 1908 book. References to Payne will mean the 1875 book unless specific mention is made of the work he wrote 25 years later, after he had become associated with Peabody. The 10 volumes listed are, thus, reduced to seven authors, to be identified chronologically as follows:

Hall	1829
Page	1847
Payne	1875
Search	1901
Dutton	1903
Chancellor	1904
Dutton and Snedden	1908

Thus designated, Hall, Page, and Payne express an emphasis on order, piety, and humane nineteenth-century values, untouched by science but full of wonderful common sense. Dutton presents a compendium broken down into an almost overwhelming array of didactic specifications for school management.[6] This work is an example of professional self-consciousness, neither effete nor exaggerated, but arising out of meticulous notation and classification of the array of tasks involved in running schools. Yet this work remains one untouched by theory, comprehensive survey of practices, or controlled experimentation. It is a work not to be ridiculed or taken lightly, a practical handbook, a comprehensive "how-to-do-it" manual.

To find the arguments of our professional ancestors hilariously funny intends no disrespect to their memory; I nominate Chancellor as the "Lord Pooh-Bah" of the group. He thunders from a mountain midway between Olympus and Ararat, frequently defending his pronouncements with the sort of impeccable idealistic logic that Boyd Bode called "horse sense made asinine." The utter finality of his statements is overwhelming, and they are occasionally uttered in beautifully quotable quotes. I think the following is my favorite Chancellorism:

> Sex is a matter of indifference, except so far as salary is concerned.[7]

Search's 1901 book and the Dutton and Snedden volume of 1908 cross the threshold into twentieth-century educational science. The one, written by a former student and ardent disciple of G. Stanley Hall, foreshadows the transformation of educational theory if not widespread practice represented by the early progressives, in the genre of John and Evelyn Dewey's *Schools of Tomorrow*, Carleton Washburne's *Adjusting the School to the Child*, and Elsie Clapp's *Community Schools in Action*. But Search, I would think, makes more administrative sense than they because he wrote as an experienced school superintendent and insisted that his proposals had specific try-outs in practice. I had never heard of P. W. Search until this project led me to him. Inasmuch as the progressive education movement of this century has been one of my major scholarly interests for a good many years, it strikes me that he may be a lost jewel. Surely this book, *An Ideal School*, deserves attention from those who continue to examine the ideological sources of the "New Education." His plan for educational parks sounds exactly like what Sidney Marland recommended for Pittsburgh in the mid-'60's. But Search insists that the transportation problems can be solved if the school schedule is set in concert with city transportation authorities to coincide with highest off-peak periods of the city transit systems.

The other modern work, Dutton and Snedden (1908), is in the science of education style of Strayer and Thorndike, to be distinguished from the developmental psychological emphasis of Hall and the child-centered school movement.[8] A good many of Dutton's cookbook recipes remain in, but at least one-third of this 600-page textbook in school administration is systematic survey and description of established prac-

tices in social context. Clearly implicit is the assumption that best practice arises out of knowledge of the range of practice currently in vogue. Here we have beginnings of the notion that inductive compilation of current instances is the stuff out of which improved policy and practice can be elicited. The survey method but nothing approaching experimentation is represented.

Such a grouping of the 10 books and seven authors consulted can be captioned as follows:

A. Mid-century works based in the accepted nineteenth-century world-view and established notions of the good life
   Hall
   Page
   Payne

B. A practical compendium of recommended best practice grounded in practical common sense and personal experience
   Dutton

C. Nineteenth-century philosophical idealism worked out in an agenda for school administration
   Chancellor

D. Foreshadowing the child-centered school emphasis in progressive education
   Search

E. Foreshadowing the science of education movement
   Dutton and Snedden

A constant theme of the early books is the necessity of order. Hall develops the argument of the utilitarians that order is a necessity of happiness.[9] Page insists that "it is a law of our being that we can do well but one thing at a time."[10] Payne argues that inasmuch as tasks must be ordered according to firstness, secondness, thirdness, etc., execution of a plan for dealing with the tasks demands an ordering of lines of authority.[11] Thus he establishes the necessity, laid down as a rule, that a school system requires direction by one responsible head.[12] Page in 1847 and Payne in 1875 develop in strongly explicit detail an

analysis of lines of authority, delegation, and sovereignty from the people to the board, to superintendents and principals, and to teachers.[13] Powers delegated to the board by the people, and to the superintendent by the board, are irrevocable during the contractual time specified unless individuals are removed from office by impeachment. The people, by electing school trustees or a school committee, delegate to them power to manage the school, thereby investing them with the power and responsibility to do so. The board delegates specified duties to the superintendent, thereby investing him in turn with rights and responsibilities, and he in turn delegates responsibilities to his subordinates, the teachers. At each level sovereignty is delegated and, once this has been done, is not to be infringed upon or withdrawn except in instances of such gross abuse as justify impeachment. To support such an arrangement, prerogatives at each level must be specified as clearly as possible, individuals, then, remaining free from interference in exercising their prerogatives. Page does not distinguish between "superintendents" and "principals," using the terms interchangeably in his 1847 book. But Payne, a quarter of a century later, treats the principal as a part-time administrator subordinate to the superintendent in his administrative role but holding the status of teacher. Thus, Payne does not provide for clear sovereignty delegated from superintendent to principal, treating the latter as a staff position.

Payne's extension of the argument of delegated sovereignty to teachers is strong and uncompromising. The administrator should trust his teachers, giving them freedom to follow their own methods of instruction and discipline within very broad general guidelines. His record of teacher evaluations should be limited to a half-dozen general criteria such as "order," "manner," "skill in instruction," "discipline." Page and Payne set a high standard indeed of academic freedom and responsibility for teachers; the most uncompromisingly ardent devotee of academic freedom in our own day could scarcely ask for more. Both Page and Payne lay great stress upon the necessity for clarity and precision of specifications as to what is delegated at each stage, urging that lack of clarity can bring down the whole structure of delegated powers.

They are, indeed, in their day, male chauvinists. Hall includes sections on goals and purposes of schools, qualifications and responsibilities of teachers, and public rela-

tions in his 1829 book.[14] Notably missing, however, from the 1832 volume directed explicitly to women primary teachers keeping the summer schools are comments on goals, purposes, and public relations.[15] It deals only with the specifics of classroom procedures. Page uses the masculine pronoun throughout, and in the many examples and illustrations the teacher is always portrayed as a man.[16] However, Payne's detailed discussion of whether women should be school administrators presupposes full admission and participation by women in teaching jobs.[17] On the issue discussed, however, Payne concludes that the position of chief school executive should be reserved for men, for at this level ". . . there is need of that judicial firmness which is characteristic of man's nature."[18]

The importance of community and public relations is stressed by all three of the mid-century authors, Hall's discussion coming closest to our contemporary view of public relations. The importance of schooling is to be made clear to parents by clear statements of what schools can and cannot do. An essential of good public relations is clear and forceful presentation of the goals of the school and the argument that these goals are worthy of benevolent public support. Thus may the educator cut through community religious and political difference to present the school's case. He advises:

> You must be prepared to govern your scholars at school, and *may* often find it necessary to exert nearly as much influence with *parents* as with them.[19]

Page advises that explicit disciplinary problems in school may be the reflection of community differences of opinion and factionalism among the parents. Even-handedness by the teacher in and out of school must be the watchword, but the teacher must, in any case, establish order in school, by corporal punishment if necessary.[20] He frowns upon expulsion as legally moot, and probably inexpedient.[21] Visits to the district by the teacher before the school term opens, along with visits to homes, both wealthy and poor, are advised, and parents should be encouraged to visit school throughout the year.[22] The teacher should get to school early on the first day so as to meet the pupils one by one as they arrive. Yet the progression must be from

informality to order; the objective is the ordering of activities.[23] Payne advocates forming lay committees to visit the schools and file written reports.

Deep moral dedication is expected of the nineteenth-century educator. Teaching is viewed by Hall as an occupation demanding total dedication, pursued under the eye of a Creator-God and Heavenly Father to whose glory the enterprise must fully redound.[24] A teacher is ". . . doing his Heavenly Father's business."[25] Teaching is a "spiritual art."[26]

The emphasis on order and ordering as a very condition of rationality, hence fundamental in school organization, has been pointed out in the mid-century works. Dutton's *School Management* might be read as the epitome of this emphasis, collated in a textbook. Dutton, professor of school administration at Teachers College, Columbia University, alleges that ". . . school management, broadly speaking, relates to the conditions affecting the school, as well as to everything that takes place there."[27] This book by Dutton is like a handbook on formal landscape gardening. The end product is a vision of orderly beauty. Total effect is the end concern. But to achieve this effect, meticulous attention to the smallest detail is demanded. This work of 275 pages includes recommendations for specific lesson outlines, placement and design of cloakrooms (to be partitioned off with wire mesh for better ventilation and drying of clothing in wet weather), and a discourse on the Herbartian doctrine of interest and the five formal steps. Specifically theological allusions do not appear in this work, but the moral ordering of the human person is the educational objective. Finally, external motivations are to be discarded as the training and discipline of the school contributes to growth toward maturity. Thus, by the ministrations of the orderly school ". . . the personality is trained, disciplined, and brought nearer to perfection."[28]

Chancellor was Superintendent of Public Instruction of the District of Columbia, lectured on education at Johns Hopkins and the George Washington University, and later became a professor of political science at the College of Wooster. In his thinking, the emphasis on order, orderliness, and ordering becomes a part of an explicit and consistent moral idealism. Thus, Chancellor's writing combines a somewhat pompous morality with didactic practical maxims for school administrators.

> Education has but one proper manner; this is orderliness. . . . Order is the manner of education, which is the method of approach to heaven, the scene and evidence of life eternal.[29]

There are a good many references to school finance and the need for more adequate financial support for schools. Chancellor sees the school administrator as a kind of moral or spiritual guide bringing higher culture to the people. The school administrator is subject to citizens and his board, like the Protestant minister, but the minister's sources of wisdom and insight are from on high.

> The school is a temple of learning, the shrine of progress. Positive philanthropy is its sacred mission.[30]

Board members, teachers, and administrators are to be persons of highest character devoted wholeheartedly to the public good. The superintendent is their moral mentor, responsible to them, yet always representing before them the model of firm and unswerving righteousness. This entire work is didactic; Chancellor pronounces and proclaims the truth. Tuesday is the best day in the week for the board meeting. The payroll per 1,000 pupils in small communities should be $60,000.[31] There are 12 basic principles of sound school administration.[32] Other examples of Chancellor's wisdom are:

> Women generally have greater difficulty in persuading boys over thirteen years of age to sing than men have, while girls of any age are easily led to sing by either men or women. Consequently, in high school, a man of singing is preferable.[33]

> Regarding text-book agents, the superintendent should welcome their coming and speed their going.[34]

> The superintendent has a certain relation to former board members, especially to those who were strong supporters of his policy.[35]

> The relation of the superintendent to "reformers" is sometimes one of special difficulty.[36]

Lest Chancellor's pomposity be construed as totally conservative, however, it is important to note his extreme strictures upon controls over education exercised by business and the state. He deplores state education for citizenship as much as he deplores the pressure of business interests upon schools.[37] The primary tasks of education as a formal system are to maintain the aristocracies of talent, to identify the best children of the masses, to elevate these children of talent and ability into the vacant places in the aristocracy, and to prepare the masses for routine work and submission to the direction of the aristocracy. But Chancellor makes clear that he is not speaking of an aristocracy of blood or material inheritance.[38] Genius may be discovered and redeemed even from the brothel and the penitentiary.

> Education is nothing but religion enlightened and energized, but always and essentially the religion of the faith that all are the sons of God, and that as long as He lives even the worst may be redeemed.[39]

Such education--education as it ought to be--is not exemplified by educational institutions in America. The public schools, in particular, are subordinate to other institutions, especially the state and business. Thus, the fundamental thrust of Chancellor's argument becomes how to bring about true education, which means rescuing the schools from the debilitating control of the political and economic establishment. Far from subsuming the task of schools to the service of business and industry, Chancellor equates "efficiency" with intellectual power.

> Efficiency is making something worth while . . . efficiency is the health of the will. . . .[40]

> Mere doing is not efficiency. The doing must be intelligent, purposeful doing of things worth while. Therefore, in a high civilization,

> the greatest efficiency is the accomplishment of a generous intelligence, yet such intelligence is in itself not enough; it is merely the condition of efficiency.[41]

Business and war are inherently immoral. Ideals which are the proper concern of the school are intelligence, efficiency, and morality, of the university science, art, and philosophy. The school is concerned with "education," the university with "culture."[42] The dedication of both the school and the university must be to health and holiness.[43] All school and university studies should finally be evaluated according to their contribution to these criteria: intelligence, efficiency, morality, science, art, philosophy, health, and holiness.

Chancellor considers that the natural human being uninfluenced by education is savage, the city dweller, barbaric. Cities are necessary for manufacturing, but people cannot make their homes in cities. People are to live in hamlets and villages built solely for habitation. The open country is for forestry and agriculture, but not for habitation. Cities will be for manufacture, mining, and trade, but not for habitation.[44]

> Education is not induction into conformity with the conventions and ideals of society; it is not adjustment to civilization (*per contra* Dewey, *School and Society*). It is the discovery of the deepest realities of the soul, which lie nearest to the Source whence all souls spring.[45]

> True civilization is progress away from Nature.[46]

In Chancellor's ideal society dedicated to the good, lay boards of control for educational affairs will be done away with, and the public will control only on financial issues. Churches, schools, and the government itself will be staffed by professionals.[47]

If Chancellor is taken to exemplify the continuing influence of Victorian high idealism on American schools at the turn of the century, we may construe Search (1901) and Dutton and Snedden (1908) foreshadowing the course of Amer-

ican educational policy during the first half of the twentieth century. For, with the exception of the back-to-the-liberal-arts movement led by Hutchins and centered mainly in the World War II years, policy arguments between 1900 and 1950 were most strongly influenced by the conflicting claims of the child-centered school and the science of education movement. Preston W. Search's *Ideal School*, inspired by G. Stanley Hall, not Dewey, is a good example of the first.[48]

Search, who studied at Clark University, published this book in 1901, after having served as superintendent of schools in Ohio and in Pueblo, Colorado, Los Angeles, and Holyoke, Massachusetts. William Torrey Harris wrote an editor's preface and G. Stanley Hall an introduction. The book is dedicated to Hall. At the outset, Search specifies that the school must be pupil-centered, democratic, and in accord with nature, and must conduct its work by the "active method."[49] It must recognize individual differences and do away with all false incentives and extrinsic rewards. Pupils must not be subordinated to the machine. A first mission of the school must be to promote physical health. Search thinks that much nearsightedness and spinal curvature is aggravated by poor school conditions.[50] Thus, schools must be built to provide much sunshine and light, play, contact with nature, handwork, and physical activity. Campus-type schools are proposed, and several farm schools are described as models. Studios, laboratories, workshops, and gardens should be included. To make such schools financially feasible, they should be located where land is cheaper, away from central cities, but with public transportation readily available.[51] Search would do away with the 12 grades and substitute four departments--play school, elementary school, intermediate school, and high school.[52] But schools should be open into the evening hours to provide a full array of community and adult education services. Appropriate summer activities should continue in the school parks during the summer months.

It seems clear that Search is applying to school planning the full developmental point of view represented by his teacher G. Stanley Hall. But he presents charts and tables of growth rates to support his arguments for individual differences and acknowledges indebtedness to John Dewey's recommendation that "school is to be life."[53] He favors departmentalization of elementary instruction so that children will have contact with several different teachers. Children are to have their own gardens at home, with school time devoted to discussions and plans concerning these gar-

dens. Toads, frogs, and even beehives will be at school from time to time. Formal instruction in reading can wait until children are eight years old. French and German are to be taught by the direct method. Letter grades are to be abolished in favor of ordinary written descriptions of the work accomplished, and conferences with parents.[54] He thinks it is a good thing for school faculties to be mainly made up of women.[55]

> The schools will always be taught largely by women, and properly so, because of woman's finer intuitions.[56]

The way to upgrade the school superintendency is to give greater responsibility to those holding the office. Search is less than enthusiastic about teacher tenure. He advocates non-partisan staggered elections of school board members, the optimum school board size being five.[57] Teachers should be appointed by the board on the superintendent's recommendation.

Surely, Search is a modern for the moderns. He refers specifically to evolution as an accepted phenomenon of nature, and there are no religious allusions in his book. Physical health, happiness, much activity, constant out-of-door movements, one-story schools full of light and air opening to the outdoors, flexible scheduling, elimination of letter grades are recommended. And he insists, in conclusion, that he is a practical school man, that his proposals have been actually tried out, that they will work.

Although separated by only five years in publication dates, Dutton's *School Management* (1903) and Dutton and Snedden's *The Administration of Public Education in the United States* (1908) are a full epoch apart in style and impact. Dutton's prescriptions for administrative practice which comprised the 1903 book on management are retained, but these are introduced and consistently supported by or related to explicit surveys of contemporary practice and references to surveys of community conditions. The later volume is characterized by conventional textbook trappings. Chapters and subdivisions are clearly captioned and organized, and the first quarter of the 600-page book is devoted to hard empirical survey data of contemporary practice. School finance is given extended treatment, and a separate chapter is devoted to educational statistics.

Surely, the great distinction between the two books must be due to the influence of the collaborator, Snedden, who, in professional education scholarship, was the first to bring scientific sociology to bear upon education. Nevertheless, Snedden's sociology, as reflected in *The Administration of Public Education in the United States*, is primitive. It exhibits the methodological presumption that stipulations of best practice are to be grounded in exhaustive enumeration and collation of current actual practices--that you must have detailed knowledge of what's going on before you formulate administrative policy. But the gap from survey of present practice to pronouncement of best policy is not bridged, even as today we frequently leap from norm-referenced to criterion-referenced policy, assuming, in spite of ourselves, that the norm becomes the criterion. The Dutton and Snedden book of 1908 combines Dutton's ingenious "seat-of-the-pants" maxims for best practice with Snedden's surveys. Relationships between the two are not shown. Their work, like ours today, remains vulnerable to the attacks of philosophical analysts who have insisted that there is a fallacy in moving from the "is" to the "ought."

In conclusion, what of relationships between our findings in this survey and recent published scholarship bearing upon schooling in nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century America? I find no explicit support for the revisionist argument that the schools functioned as agencies of capitalist oppression. However, there is overwhelming evidence that the schools did represent the moral values affirmed by the official, standard, or established society. Thus, if the revisionist scholars succeed in demonstrating that the nineteenth-century Establishment exemplified capitalist oppression, their argument will hold, by extension, for the schools. It is abundantly clear that the schoolmen did not kowtow explicitly to those in positions of political and economic power; their dedication was to righteousness and purity, and they took strong and courageous positions insisting that schools were not to be subverted in control by special interests. The revisionists cannot show explicit subservience of the schoolmen to the Establishment; their argument must rest primarily on showing that the capitalist mentality was implicit in the Christian-Idealist moral code of the social order of the time. In this connection, it is to be noted that Chancellor, who in so many ways epitomizes the caricatured nineteenth-century Idealist, takes a posi-

tion worthy of Paul Goodman in deploring the control of schools by politicians and businessmen.

As for Tyack's impressively documented and beautifully expressed argument that the schoolmen of this earlier period were driven by the vision of perfection, this small study supports the position fully. They believed in the true, the good, and the beautiful and considered that all human beings are perfectible toward the *summum bonum*. Thus, they did, indeed, assume as a constant the possibility of a one best system, and all their efforts were devoted to this end. The possibility of educational pluralism does not even occur to them, as if "multi-cultural education" would be an obvious and blatant contradiction in terms.

This being the case, Cronin's excoriation of the take-over by the schoolmen when they became powerful enough to do it is supported.[58] But a judgment made by Cronin which might well be examined for its grounds is that the "tiny minority of owners and college graduates who wanted the schools to preserve and protect their way of life" were guilty of narrow self-interest.[59] This might be extremely difficult to support, for the feature of the nineteenth-century outlook which gave it its greatest strength was its universal humanism. All children, including those of the immigrants, were children of God, subject to his universal law, and perfectible in his image. Non-sectarian schools avoided sectarian interpretations of this world-view only to make possible its full and explicit propagation in the schools. And when the schoolmen took over from the ward bosses, it was because they thought ward politics interfered with the great crusade to extend the vision of the good to every child.

I am aware that our habit of downgrading the moral idealism of our forebears is so ingrained that what has just been suggested verges on the apparently maudlin or ridiculous. But I found not a shred of evidence in the books I examined of an explicit sell-out by schoolmen to a business-industrial model of economic efficiency. This sampling would suggest that if that came, it came after 1908. Indeed, it would be entirely in order to extend the sampling. It is also within the realm of possibility that the nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century schoolmen had glimpsed the beatific vision which St. Thomas Aquinas taught was the joint product of faith and reason at work.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 1

1. Cronin, 1973, p. xxi.
2. Reller, 1941, p. 8.
3. NEA, Journal of Proceedings and Addresses, 1895, pp. 375-397.
4. Reller, 1935, pp. 281-282.
5. Ibid.
6. Dutton, 1903.
7. Chancellor, 1915, p. 211.
8. Dutton and Snedden, 1908.
9. Hall, 1829, p. 73.
10. Page, 1847, p. 202.
11. Payne, 1875, pp. 13 ff.
12. Payne, 1875, p. 17.
13. Page, 1847, pp. 364 ff.
14. Hall, 1829.
15. Hall, 1832.
16. Page, 1847.
17. Payne, 1875, pp. 46 ff.
18. Payne, 1875, p. 48.
19. Hall, 1829, p. 44.
20. Page, 1847, p. 243.
21. Page, 1847, p. 248.
22. Page, 1847, pp. 264-265, 282.

23. Payne, 1875.
24. Hall, 1929, pp. 48-49.
25. Page, 1847, p. 401.
26. Payne, 1901, pp. 72 ff.
27. Dutton, 1903, 1909, p. 3.
28. Ibid., p. 105.
29. Chancellor, 1907, p. 29.
30. Ibid., p. 160.
31. Ibid., p. 88.
32. Ibid., pp. 88-89.
33. Ibid., p. 211.
34. Ibid., p. 168.
35. Ibid., p. 164.
36. Ibid., p. 187.
37. Ibid., 1907, pp. 43 ff.
38. Ibid., pp. 92-93.
39. Ibid., p. 111.
40. Ibid., p. 221.
41. Ibid., p. 243.
42. Ibid., pp. 310-328.
43. Ibid., p. 385.
44. Ibid., p. 460.
45. Ibid., p. 465.
46. Ibid., p. 479.

47. Ibid., p. 497.

48. Search, 1901.

49. Search, p. 1.

50. Search, p. 47.

51. Search, p. 102.

52. Ibid., p. 95.

53. Ibid., p. 175.

54. Ibid., p. 213.

55. Ibid., pp. 302-303.

56. Ibid.

57. Ibid., p. 305.

58. Cronin, 1973, pp. xxi, 57-58.

59. Ibid., p. 58.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, 1859.

Chancellor, William E. *Our Schools: Their Administration and Supervision.* First published in 1904. Boston: Heath, 1915.

Chancellor, William E. *A Theory of Motives, Ideals, and Values in Education.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1907.

Cronin, Joseph. *The Control of Urban Schools: Perspective on the Power of Educational Reformers.* New York: Free Press, 1973.

Dutton, Samuel T. *School Management.* First published in 1903. New York: Scribner's, 1909.

Dutton, Samuel T., and David Snedden. *The Administration of Public Education in the United States.* New York: Macmillan, 1908.

Hall, Samuel R. *Lectures on School-keeping.* Boston: Richardson, Lord, and Holbrook, 1829. Republished by Arno Press.

Hall, Samuel R. *Lectures to Female Teachers on School-keeping.* Boston: Richardson, Lord, and Holbrook, 1832. Republished by Arno Press.

National Education Association, *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses*, 1895, pp. 375-397.

Page, David P. *Theory and Practice of Teaching.* Originally published in 1847. New edition, edited and enlarged by W. H. Payne. New York and Chicago: A. S. Barnes, 1885.

Payne, William H. *Chapters on School Supervision.* Cincinnati and New York: Wilson, Hinkle & Co., 1875.

Payne, William H. *Education of Teachers.* Richmond, Va.: B. F. Johnson, 1901.

Reller, Theodore L. *The Development of the City Superintendency of Schools in the United States.* Philadelphia: Published by the Author, 1935.

Reller, Theodore L. "Superintendents of Schools. Duties and Responsibilities," in Walter S. Monroe (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Educational Research.* New York: Macmillan, 1941.

Search, Preston W. *An Ideal School.* New York: Appleton, 1901.

Chapter 2

From Ideology to Conventional Wisdom: School Administration Texts 1915–1933

William Eaton

The decade between 1901 and 1911 was a period when education emerged as a true profession. The struggle to achieve this professionalization was one that had extended back for about 75 years when such New England schoolmen as James Carter, Horace Mann, Henry Barnard, and William Russell first began to write and talk about the day when teachers would be trained, when schools would be satisfactorily equipped and financed, when curricula would be planned, and when a body of principles concerning the science of pedagogy would be clearly elucidated. The details of what happened between 1901 and 1911 to complete the evolution of the profession, however, are beyond the scope of this paper. It suffices to say that among the factors were the establishment of strong professional associations, the existence of influential periodicals, stronger certification provisions, the beginnings of graduate instruction in professional education, the school survey and standardization movement, and the systematic publication of textbooks that would not only enumerate the principles of education in general, but would divide the field into specializations each of which were beginning to build a base of empirically verifiable data. It is this last factor, the publication of textbooks, that this paper will discuss.

When Paul Monroe published the influential *Cyclopaedia of Education* in 1911, he mentioned in the introduction that of 8,745 new books issued in the United States for the year 1910, 348 of them were new titles in education.[1] An analysis of the books published in this era reveals that the two educational specialties most written about were the history

of education and educational administration. Of these two, the number of titles in administration, which includes supervision, certainly dominates in terms of quantity if not quality. Who wrote these books on school administration? Was it the successful practitioners such as Harris of St. Louis, Gove of Denver, Young of Chicago, or Maxwell of New York? The answer to the question is generally no. The educational administration books that were being published just immediately prior to 1915 were being written by education professors. These professors can be grouped into two camps--those from Teachers College, Columbia University (TC), and those from a number of regional teachers colleges. The vital difference between the two is that the authors from Teachers College, Columbia, were attempting to establish their generalizations upon some kind of evidence scientifically gleaned, while most of the authors at the various regional teachers colleges were preparing books for largely local consumption with the more traditional style of basing theories upon personal experience, common sense, and an occasional quote from one of the grand masters such as Horace Mann or William Torrey Harris.

Prior to 1875 it didn't make sense to talk about school administration, since that occupation employed such a small number of people that a separate literature was unnecessary. Between 1875 and 1900, however, the growth in the number of positions of superintendent and full-time principal was spectacular and signaled the need for special training and the textbooks that such training would require. The modern textbook in school administration was a product of the early twentieth century, and the book deserving recognition as the first was Samuel Train Dutton's *School Management: Practical Suggestions Concerning the Conduct and Life of the School*, published by Scribner's in 1903. The book, though not using footnotes, does credit authors who are quoted. In this, and in several other ways, it can be regarded as a transitional book bridging those texts of the old era and those of the new era. Like texts of the nineteenth century, it often falls back upon unproven axioms and moralistic judgments. But it represents the modern era by defining the roles of both superintendent and principal and offers a task analysis of their respective roles. Though recognizing the need for efficiency, Dutton rejects the pernicious analogy of the school as a factory. Dutton's book, by admission, is aimed at the big-city school system.

If Dutton's book deserves credit as the first, the credit for the second must go to William E. Chancellor's *Our*

Schools: Their Administration and Supervision, published by D. C. Heath in 1904. Chancellor was the Superintendent of Schools at Bloomfield, New Jersey, which disproves my earlier maxim that practicing administrators were getting out of the business of writing textbooks. Chancellor uses the introduction to his book to justify the need for texts such as his and Dutton's by saying:

> With the growth of our schools in size and in number and with their development in resources and in methods, their organization tends constantly to grow more complex. Recently there has been differentiated from the teachers a class of school directors, administrators, and supervisors, whose function is management rather than instruction. These school managers see the schools from a point of view different from that of the instructors. So recent has been their appearance in the world of education that not only the general public, but even many instructors, do not yet understand the nature and value of their work. To present the subject of American education from the new point of view of the administrator and supervisor is the purpose of this book.[2]

Chancellor did not use any citations or even have a bibliography, so it is impossible to trace the sources of his information. It was Chancellor who has obtained contemporary rancor by his cavalier insistence that women made bad school board members. He also thought they made poor administrators on the grounds that if they were mothers they were probably too soft-hearted, and if they weren't they were suspect for another set of reasons. It was Chancellor who began the discussion of who makes good and who makes bad board members which was so characteristic of all of the books in the era of my investigation.

Chancellor's book is written in a straightforward manner. Only twice does he try to dazzle the reader by using Latin or Greek quotations. In the copy that I examined, Chancellor, while speaking of school boards, said: "There is a popular idea that, though no one of a dozen men knows much of anything about school teaching, the entire dozen, as a body, has an expert, and therefore a valuable opinion on the subject. This is an interesting aspect of the popular

belief in America, *Vox populi, vox dei*."[3] A disgruntled student has penned into the margin the following protest: "Speak the American language, you boob!" The use of the Menckenesque word "boob" makes me believe that the protest is itself 50 years old. Chancellor and Dutton set the model for modern books on school administration from 1903 to 1933. Both are widely quoted and frequently cited. But there were other efforts as well.

The Macmillan Company of New York City published a number of important works on education before 1915. In their stable of authors could be found such luminaries as Paul Monroe, Nicholas Murray Butler, William Bagley, Herman Horne, Charles McMurry, Charles DeGarmo, Paul Hanus, Edward L. Thorndike, George Strayer, Frank Graves, Samuel Dutton, and David Snedden--a rather formidable array of educational talent. In 1909 Dutton, of Teachers College, Columbia University, again published an administrative textbook, this time with David Snedden. Their *Administration of Public Education in the United States* was published by Macmillan. A reading of this textbook leaves the reader with the feeling of having just completed something very systematic, very comprehensive, and very boring. The book's nearly 600 pages are *descriptive* but not *prescriptive*. The sources used are at least cited, which represents a change from the nineteenth-century practice. Interesting to note is that a large number of citations come from recently completed dissertations done at TC by students such as Ellwood P. Cubberley and George D. Strayer. Like other books of its time, Dutton and Snedden's criticizes the large school boards which have dominated in America's large cities but which are already universally condemned for their graft and inefficiency and are in the process of being changed into smaller appointed boards. In reference to school boards, they also address another popular topic--"who makes good board members," but they speak to the issue in only indirect and polite terms indicating that board members should be honest, should be people of large affairs, and should not be compensated for their duties. This latter condemnation of compensation was already the conventional wisdom among schoolmen. Dutton and Snedden's book was aimed at the large national audience, which it reached. Where most of the nineteenth-century books had been regional in character, Dutton and Snedden use studies, statistics, and descriptions from all across the country. Their book has to be recognized as the important standard-bearer of the time period.

Also coming out of TC was a book entitled *Educational*

Administration: Quantitative Studies, done by Strayer and Thorndike, published in 1913. Though the book was not written as a primary text in school administration, but rather as a supplement, it deserves recognition not only because of the subsequent fame of its authors but for its heavy emphasis upon establishing an empirical base for the administration of the schools. Again the TC dissertations, which were already being published as the *Teachers College Contributions to Education Series*, provided the numbers which Strayer and Thorndike statistically analyzed. The book has 24 chapters which deal with such topics as "Enrollment in Relation to Age and Grade" and "School Achievement in Arithmetic." The book contains 144 full-page statistical tables. This is clearly a break from the nineteenth century. But the biggest break from the past, in this author's point of view, came with the publication of *Public School Administration* by Ellwood Patterson Cubberley in 1916.

In 1898, Cubberley resigned a higher-paying job as the Superintendent of Schools in San Diego to accept a position at the newly founded Leland Stanford Jr. University. Realizing the necessity of obtaining degrees beyond his bachelor's, he left the West Coast during the summer for Teachers College, Columbia, to complete a master's degree in 1902 and a doctorate in 1905. His master's research paper, entitled *Syllabus of Lectures on the History of Education, With Selected Bibliographies and Suggestions as to Reading*, was published by Macmillan in 1904. His dissertation, *School Funds and Their Apportionment*, did appear in the *Contributions* series but was not commercially published. This was a serious oversight which Cubberley more than made up for later by using the material in several of his subsequent books. Earlier, this paper alluded to history and administration as being the first two specialties developed within education. With his *Essays* and *School Funds* Cubberley was at the forefront of both movements.

From 1909 to 1911 Cubberley worked as a departmental editor for Monroe's *Cyclopaedia of Education*, writing 130 entries for the *Cyclopaedia* and, in the process, gathering a mass of data. While teaching a summer session at Harvard in 1911, he made the short trip into Boston to visit Houghton Mifflin to propose an educational series under his general editorship. He had already published a book entitled *Changing Conceptions of Education* with the company in 1909 and knew the editors. This latest trip was the birth of the Riverside Series--which ultimately ran to 105 volumes with Cubberley serving as general editor and personally producing

10 titles for the series. Cubberley's biographers state that the series sold about 3,070,000 books and that Cubberley's books accounted for 341,000 of that larger number. Cubberley's titles are:[4]

1. *Rural Life and Education*, 1914
2. *Public School Administration*, 1916
3. *Public Education in the United States*, 1919
4. *Readings in the History of Education*, 1920
5. *The History of Education*, 1922
6. *A Brief History of Education*, 1922
7. *The Principal and His School*, 1923
8. *An Introduction to the Study of Education and to Teaching*, 1925
9. *State School Administration*, 1927
10. *Readings in Public Education in the United States*, 1934

The two most important of the 10 to school administration were the 1916 *Public School Administration* and the 1923 *The Principal and His School*.

Cubberley, in collaboration with Edward Elliott of the University of Wisconsin, had published their *State and County School Administration* in 1915 with Macmillan. But this was a source book written as volume 2 to accompany a principles book that was never published. Cubberley saved his "principles" for his *Public School Administration*, which was published by Houghton Mifflin the following year.

Cubberley's *Public School Administration*, like Dutton and Snedden's book of seven years earlier, was national in scope and comprehensive in coverage. But unlike Dutton and Snedden, Cubberley's authoritative voice was *prescriptive* and not merely *descriptive*. An analysis of the book's 351 citations reveals that Cubberley's four largest sources of data were the National Education Association's (NEA's) *Proceedings* (26%); *The Educational Review* (14%); reports from various school surveys (10%); and reports and bulletins of

the U.S. Commissioner of Education (9%). These four sources account for about 60% of the references listed by Cubberley, the remaining coming from a variety of articles from assorted journals, and other textbooks including Chancellor's and Dutton and Snedden's books. The use of the NEA *Proceedings* and *Educational Review*, these two sources accounting for 40%, are brought into use to provide Cubberley with the force of expert power as he widely quotes the speeches and articles of the nation's big-city school superintendents. Even the annual reports of these superintendents to their respective school boards are quoted not only by Cubberley but by most textbook authors of the period. The book *A Quarter Century of Public Development*, published in 1912 by William H. Maxwell, is nothing more than excerpts from Superintendent Maxwell's reports to the Brooklyn and then the consolidated New York school boards plus a few of his NEA addresses.

Cubberley's third major source of information for his *Public School Administration* was that body of literature provided by the fast-growing school survey movement. Cubberley's significant firsthand knowledge of these surveys came from his being a pioneer in their development and having personally participated in the school surveys of Baltimore in 1911, Portland, Oregon, in 1913, Butte in 1914, Oakland and Salt Lake City in 1915, Denver in 1916, and the State of New Mexico in 1921. Some of the more important surveys published between 1913 and 1922 were:[5]

Year	Principal Author of Report
1913	
Bridgeport, Conn.	James Van Sickle
New York City	Paul Hanus
1914	
Butte, Mont.	E. P. Cubberley
South Bend, Ind.	Franklin Bobbitt
Springfield, Ill.	Leonard Ayers
1915	
Oakland, Cal.	E. P. Cubberley
San Antonio, Tex.	Franklin Bobbitt

Year	Principal Author of Report
Portland, Ore.	E. P. Cubberley
1916	
Boston, Mass.	James Van Sickle
Denver, Colo.	C. H. Judd
Grand Rapids, Mich.	C. H. Judd
Salt Lake City, Utah	E. P. Cubberley
1917	
Brookline, Mass.	James Van Sickle
Cleveland, Ohio	Leonard Ayers
Minneapolis, Minn.	Charles Prosser
St. Paul, Minn.	Charles Prosser and George Strayer
1918	
Gary, Ind.	Abraham Flexner
Nassau Co., N.Y.	George Strayer
St. Louis, Mo.	C. H. Judd
1919	
State of Maryland	Abraham Flexner
Memphis, Tenn.	Philander Claxton
State of Virginia	Alexander Inglis
1920	
Baltimore, Md.	George Strayer
Boise, Idaho	Jesse Sears
1921	
Arlington, Minn.	Jesse Sears
Atlanta, Ga.	George Strayer and N. L. Engelhardt
Hackensack, N.J.	George Strayer and N. L. Engelhardt

Year	Principal Author of Report
1922	
Augusta, Me.	Alexander Inglis

These surveys provided Cubberley with both numerical data and "general" principles. The reports and bulletins of the U.S. Commissioner were also used for the statistics and identification of national issues.

Cubberley's *Public School Administration* also deserves credit for being among the first of administration textbooks to quote state laws and court cases concerning education. He probably deserves credit for giving birth to the specialization of school law among professors of educational administration. His book *State and County Educational Reorganization: The Revised Constitution and School Code of the State of Osceola*, published by Macmillan in 1914, and his *State and County School Administration* of 1915 had acquainted him with the diverse school laws of the country. From that point on he would make frequent legal citations. But the inclusion of all of these materials still doesn't fully explain why Cubberley's texts were so widely used and critically acclaimed. The reasons for their success are more than just the Cubberley name, for certainly Dutton, Snedden, Strayer, and others enjoyed high professional reputation as well. The success of Cubberley's administration books is at least fivefold: (1) they were comprehensive and systematic, (2) they were written in an interesting but uncomplicated style, (3) they were authoritative and prescriptive, even "cookbookish," (4) they were immensely practical, and (5) they employed several successful techniques in their format, such as study and discussion questions, numerous charts and graphs, and drawings.

That these books were comprehensive and systematic is easily discovered by a quick perusal of their tables of contents. Cubberley not only identified central administration problems, he generally provided the reader with useful background material to the issue, often of a historical nature. After tracing the evolution of the problem and

stating it boldly in contemporary terms he proceeded with dispatch to solve it before the end of the chapter. Cubberley's style is very straightforward and free from qualifiers and unnecessary adjectives. His prose is also heavily flowered by the epic proportions of "the great struggle to develop common schools" themes so ordinary among all the schoolmen. The common school quest is the search for the Holy Grail, and the knight in shining armor is the school superintendent or principal whose purity in the quest for school efficiency and human perfection is not overshadowed by the godly Sir Gwayne. Cubberley writes with quiet passion and without artifice.

Certainly Cubberley's books are authoritative and prescriptive. Where some others hint, he states. Where others suggest, he insists. Where some leave open for further discussion, he concludes. His books were also very practical. In Cubberley's 1923 *The Principal and His School* there are entire chapters dedicated to the first day of school, and how to operate in a crowded building. There are sections on how to run a fire drill and how to supervise the toilets. There are also model forms that can be copied and modified for local use. His references at the ends of chapters are annotated. And lastly, the books had an attractive format and eye appeal; they not only sounded better, they looked better.

The content of Cubberley's *Public School Administration* provides the modern reader with a good idea of educational issues of 70 years ago. The two pivotal problems for Cubberley were the composition and role of the school board and the qualifications and duties of the school superintendent. The book is unabashedly aimed at the larger city school superintendents and grew out of a course called "City School Administration," which he taught at TC during the summer of 1914. The school board, to Cubberley's mind, should be small, preferably with five to seven members. These members should not receive compensation, or to use his own language: "It may be accepted as a fundamental principle in American educational administration that a school board should not be paid for its services." The school board must also have the right kind of members. Bad board members include teamsters, blacksmiths, young politicians, and cranks with axes to grind. Good board members can be formed from machinists, shoe clerks, real estate agents, druggists, lumberyard foremen, hotel keepers, and old and busy lawyers. In terms of duties, the board should be legislative and not executive in function. Its central job is to hire a good superintendent.

The superintendent should be a man of "strong character, broad sympathies, high purposes, fine culture, courage, exact training, and executive skill. . . ."[6] He should be clean in mind and body, be temperate in speech and act, be honest and square, have a high sense of personal honor, possess the manners and courtesy of a gentleman, and have a sense of humor.[7] As he prepares for the responsibilities of a superintendency he should be willing to move around, and, says Cubberley: "If salary does not seem large enough to cover both married life and study, he should for a time resolutely put marriage aside."[8] As he goes on to identify the constituent parts of the superintendent's role, it should be noted that Cubberley is not one of those who contributed to the excesses of the school efficiency movement so lucidly described by Raymond Callahan in his 1962 book *Education and the Cult of Efficiency*. To the contrary, he warns the superintendent in his *Principles* to save time for "broad" thinking and to avoid spending too much time on any one thing such as "bills and supplies, and the general routine work of a business clerk. . . ." This theme is continued in his *Principal and His School*, where the job analysis he made of the principalship revealed that 85% of their time was being spent on managerial tasks. He recommended that at least 45% of their time be spent in the classroom and even provided a daily schedule for the principal to follow that would allow for this new distribution.[9] It's interesting to note that Cubberley uses the job analysis model which had been developed during World War I.

While Ellwood P. Cubberley occupied the center ring from 1915 to 1934, there were other textbook writers performing their acts. Just as Cubberley's *Public School Administration* and *The Principal and His School* played to the needs of the city, there was a separate and parallel literature growing for the smaller communities and rural areas.

In 1912 Mabel Carney, of Teachers College, Columbia, wrote *Country Life and the Country School*, which was published by Row and Peterson. This book, and others which followed in its wake, were tied to a broader national movement of concern for rural America in the age of industrialization and urbanization. Carney's book began what was to become a rather steady stream of books on rural education by authors such as J. B. Arp, G. H. Betts, and others. Seeing this area develop, the Macmillan Company asked Mabel Carney to serve as general editor of its Rural Education Series. Two of these books, *Rural School Management* by Ina Barnes in 1929 and *Principles of Rural School Administration* by Julian

Butterworth in 1926, directly concern administration. Butterworth held the title of Professor of Rural Education at Cornell University, which was very active in the rural movement. The majority of Butterworth's quotations come from bulletins of the U.S. Commissioner of Education and the 1922 Survey of Rural Education in the State of New York, undertaken by Carney, Judd, Butterworth, and others. Barnes was a rural school supervisor in LaGrange County, Indiana. Her use of the word "management" is really intended as classroom management vis-a-vis William Chandler Bagley rather than being concerned with administration. Several other of the large publishers either began series or encouraged textbooks dealing with rural education at this time, and Houghton Mifflin was among them. Thus, Cubberley was again at the forefront.

Cubberley's *Rural Life and Education* was published in 1914, before he turned his attention to city schools. Even after moving into urban education, though, Cubberley kept his fingers on the pulse of the rural education movement. In 1925 John Almack and James Bursch wrote *The Administration of Consolidated and Village Schools* for the Riverside Series.

James F. Bursch was an assistant professor at the Oregon Agricultural College, but co-author John C. Almack was an associate professor at Stanford under Dean Cubberley. It's interesting to note that by the 1930's most of the regional efforts at textbook writing had disappeared. Undoubtedly part of this is attributable to the phasing out of small book printers and the consolidation of commercial houses, coupled with more national approaches to school problems. One book that disproves the rule, however, is entitled *The Superintendent at Work in Smaller Schools* by R. V. Hunkins, published by D. C. Heath in 1931. Hunkins was superintendent at Lead, South Dakota. There are no footnotes where one might trace Hunkins' sources, but at the end of his book he mentions five books of extreme importance--one is the Almack and Bursch book previously mentioned, another is Ward Reeder's *The Fundamentals of Public School Administration*, and the last three are all titles written by Cubberley.

The various titles that concerned themselves with rural school administration utilized many of the generalizations that were emerging from sociology. This was also true of those texts that concerned urban education. The difference seems to be that the rural books were using social analytic

frameworks, while the urban related books were using job and bureaucratic analyses. It really wasn't popular for urban books to use social analysis until the 1960's.

I have intended to show that Cubberley dominated the books on city school administration prior to 1933, but it would be wrong to suggest that he had a monopoly. George D. Strayer and N. L. Engelhardt's *Problems in Educational Administration* was published by the TC Bureau of Publications in 1925. Carter Alexander, Paul Mort, and others contributed to this 750-page volume. Though incorporating an excellent bibliography, some of the latest work done at TC such as the Strayer-Haig financial formulas, and thorough coverage on a number of vital topics, it didn't really compete with Cubberley since it was not published by a commercial house. Another example of an administrative text published before 1933 would be Oscar Weber's *Problems in Public School Administration*, published by Century in 1930.

From the 1920's onward, it should be noted that a group of administrative sub-specialties come into full bloom. This paper has previously alluded to school law. Added to law, buildings, finance, and supervision of curriculum and instruction come into being. Selecting finance as an example shows books such as Strayer and Haig's *Financing of Education in the State of New York*, Pittenger's *An Introduction to Public School Finance*, Moehlman's *Public School Finance*, Engelhardt's *Public School Business Administration*, and Reeder's *The Business Administration of a School System* all being published between 1923 and 1929.

Cubberley's near monopoly of general school administrative texts continued with his publication of *State School Administration: A Textbook of Principles* in 1927. The format was typical of his earlier works. Roughly the first third of the book is devoted to historical evolution and the latter two-thirds deals with problems. Throughout his long period of productivity, Cubberley favored strong state systems of education as best confronting the two-edged sword of localism and federal control. The state promised to be the best vehicle for supervising local school districts.

In 1933 Ellwood P. Cubberley retired from Stanford. He left the field of publishing having witnessed the rise of the textbook as a primary tool in the training of school administrators. This primacy would continue into subsequent epochs.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

1. Monroe, p. xi.
2. Chancellor, p. v.
3. Ibid., p. 49.
4. Sears and Henderson, p. 98 and appendix.
5. Sears, pp. 429-433.
6. Cubberley, *Public School Administration*, p. 131.
7. Ibid., pp. 135-137.
8. Ibid., p. 144.
9. Cubberley, *The Principal and His School*, p. 46.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Almack, John C., and James F. Bursch. *The Administration of Consolidated and Village Schools.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1925.

Ayer, Fred C., and A. S. Barr. *The Organization of Supervision.* New York: Appleton, 1928.

Barnes, Ina G. *Rural School Management.* New York: Macmillan, 1929.

Butterworth, Julian. *Principles of Rural School Administration.* New York: Macmillan, 1926.

Callahan, Raymond. *Education and the Cult of Efficiency.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Carney, Mabel. *Country Life and the Country School.* Chicago: Row and Peterson, 1912.

Chancellor, William E. *Our Schools: Their Administration and Supervision.* Boston: Heath, 1904.

Cubberley, Ellwood P. *The Principal and His School: The Organization, Administration, and Supervision of Instruction in an Elementary School.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1923.

Cubberley, Ellwood P. *Public School Administration.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1916.

Cubberley, Ellwood P. *School Funds and Their Apportionment.* New York: Teachers College Contributions to Education, 1905.

Cubberley, Ellwood P. *State and County Educational Reorganization: The Revised Constitution and School Code of the State of Osceola.* New York: Macmillan, 1914.

Cubberley, Ellwood P. *State School Administration: A Textbook of Principles.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1927.

Cubberley, Ellwood P. *Syllabus of Lectures on the History of Education, With Selected Bibliographies and Suggestions as to Reading.* New York: Macmillan, 1904.

Cubberley, Ellwood P., and Edward Elliott. *State and County School Administration,* Vol. 2. New York: Macmillan, 1915.

Culter, Horace M., and Julia M. Stone. *The Rural School: Its Methods and Management.* New York: Silver Burdett, 1913.

Dutton, Samuel T. *School Management: Practical Suggestions Concerning the Conduct and Life of the School.* New York: Scribner's, 1903.

Dutton, Samuel T., and David Snedden. *The Administration of Public Education in the United States.* New York: Macmillan, 1909.

Hanus, Paul. *School Administration and School Reports.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1920.

Hanus, Paul. *School Efficiency: A Constructive Study Applied to New York City.* Yonkers, N.Y.: World Book Co., 1913.

Hines, L. N. "The Ideal School Board from the Superintendent's Point of View," NEA *Proceedings* (1911), pp. 994-1002.

Hinsdale, R. A. "The American School Superintendent," *Educational Review*, Vol. VII (January 1894), pp. 42-54.

Hunkins, R. V. *The Superintendent at Work in Smaller Schools*. Boston: Heath, 1931.

Koos, Leonard V. *The Administration of Secondary-School Units*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (Supplementary Educational Monographs, Vol. 7k #3), 1917.

Maxwell, William H. *A Quarter Century of Public School Development*. New York: American Book Co., 1912.

Monroe, Paul (ed.). *A Cyclopaedia of Education*. New York: Macmillan, 1911.

Sears, Jesse B. *The School Survey: A Textbook on the Use of School Surveying in the Administration of Public Schools*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1925.

Sears, Jesse B., and Adin D. Henderson. *Cubberley of Stanford*. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1957.

Strayer, George D., and N. L. Engelhardt. *Problems in Educational Administration*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1925.

Strayer, George D., and Edward L. Thorndike. *Educational Administration: Quantitative Studies*. New York: Macmillan, 1913.

Suzzallo, Henry. *The Rise of Local School Supervision in Massachusetts*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1906.

Weber, Oscar F. *Problems in Public School Administration*. New York: Century, 1930.

Chapter 3

From Conventional Wisdom to Concept: School Administration Texts 1934–1945

James C. Parker

Education administration textbook writers during the period from 1934 to 1945 sought to interpret and apply two opposing educational philosophies: the school as the agency of society and the school as the pioneer of society.[1] Partly in reaction to the unquestioning scientism of the then conventional school administration wisdom, and partly in reaction to the economic and social upheaval of the Great Depression, the writers struggled to formulate a new conception of school administration based on cooperation, participation, and democracy. But they were reluctant to denigrate conventional wisdom. Thus, with two exceptions, the textbooks revieved for this paper present a dualism characteristic of the period: distilled conventional wisdom and fermenting concept. Newlon, the analytic philosopher, and Koopman, Miel, and Misner, the practitioner engineers, are the exceptions. Throughout their books they advocate and demonstrate the emerging concepts of cooperation, participation, and democracy.

Writers of textbooks revieved in detail were overwhelmingly men and professors of education or secondary education. Only one, Alice Miel, instructor at Teachers College, Columbia, was female, and only one, Dennis Cooke of George Peabody College for Teachers, was designated in his book at the time of publication a professor of administration.

In an attempt to depict and characterize this period as revealed through school administration textbooks, answers to the following questions will be attempted. What influences

and problems inherited from preceding years continued during the 1930's and 1940's? How did the literature of the period define and describe school administration? And, what were the purposes and functions of school administration?

The format or approach this paper will utilize is one of the discussion of specific topics and how they are treated in the examined literature.

Teacher Preparation

Although much progress had been made in the preparation of teachers during the previous quarter century, lack of preparation for teaching continued to concern school administration textbook writers. Many elementary and secondary schools, rural and urban, continued to be ". . . filled with raw recruits drawn from the upper elementary and high school grades, with meager academic equipment and with little or no previous pedagogic guidance."[2] Data from the National Survey of the Education of Teachers, commissioned by Congress and published in 1933, tend to support this unpreparedness notion. The National Survey showed that 26% of all teachers nationally had one year or less of college work. Forty-six percent had two years of college, 16% had three years, and 10% had four years. About 2% had one or more years of graduate work.[3] Teachers with the least amount of preparation were usually found in small, rural schools, while those with the most preparation were usually found in the cities. Supervision, in-service training, and the demonstration lesson were not luxuries. They were necessities.[4] The standard was two years of preparation to teach elementary school; three years, junior high; four years, high school.[5]

Since the National Survey also showed that there were more than enough "technically certified people" to fill all existing vacancies, writers urged that preparation and certification standards be raised not only to establish a profession of teaching comparable to law, medicine, and engineering, but also to prevent persons from coming into teaching because of unemployment in chosen occupations.

Teacher Training Institutions

In the 1930's the two-year normal schools, some of which had originally been secondary schools, were rapidly transforming themselves into teachers colleges, requiring gen-

erally the completion of a four-year high school program for admission and a four-year college program for graduation. This was seen by one writer, Samuel E. Weber, Associate Superintendent in Charge of Personnel, Pittsburgh, to herald ". . . the dawn of a teaching profession in the United States."[6] So encouraged was he by the teachers colleges' exaction of higher admission and graduation standards, as well as by the competition for jobs caused by teacher oversupply, that he predicted by the 1950's the untrained and incompetent would be largely eliminated.[7]

Certification agencies and regional accrediting associations relied heavily on teacher training institutions to enforce established standards in terms of degrees, hours, credits, and courses and thereby to determine who would become eligible to teach. Teacher training institutions were implored to analyze carefully the positions for which they were offering training so that they would not graduate or surely not certify anyone poorly qualified to hold a teaching position. One writer warned that "The alternative point of view is for the teacher-training institution to regard itself as a kind of factory, turning out a product which meets only the coarse legal specifications, hustling for orders, and placing teachers on the basis of competition with other training agencies. Such an outlook is too much one of responsibility to the teacher candidate rather than to the pupils who are to be taught."[8]

Teacher Certification

Originally a local school district function, the certification of teachers gradually became a state function. The trend during the period under consideration was definitely toward abolition of local certificates and centralization of certification authority in the hands of state superintendents of instruction.[9] Too, because accrediting and certification standards were being defined in academic and professional course work terms, teacher certification based on scholastic attainment at, and on credentials from, recognized institutions began to supersede local and state written examinations.

As state superintendents took over the certifying function, there was a general reduction in types of certificates issued.[10] The state office in its ". . . detachment from those personal, pecuniary, and political influences which must always surround the actual employing situation . . ."

was a logical place to bring a degree of standardization to teacher certification, thereby making credentials valid over a wider area. Another effect of state certification was to limit the field of applicants and to indicate certain minimum attainments and qualifications.[11]

Although there was considerable variation among the states concerning certification standards, Koos and others wrote in 1940 that there were certain recognized requirements for high school teachers. For instance, by the 1940's most states had made graduation from a four-year undergraduate program a requirement for permanent certification. However, for most states, teaching experience and a normal school certificate were still acceptable for a lower-level teaching credential. Most of the time this level of certificates also carried a salary differential, with the four-year degree carrying an increased salary.[12]

Also, the types of courses required of teachers in the 1940's shifted decidedly toward required professional education courses. The number varied, depending on whether elementary or secondary certification was involved. The elementary certificates usually required about 24 hours in professional courses; secondary certification, perhaps as few as 6 semester hours.[13]

Probably the most important development of this time period was the development of special certificates or endorsements for specialty areas such as special education, vocations, art, music, home economics, agriculture, and business. This trend first developed in the urban schools in the 1930's and spread downward into smaller school districts.

Teacher Salaries and Load

Teachers' salaries have historically lagged behind income levels of other professions requiring like amounts of preparation. Just prior to the Great Depression, because teachers' salaries were so low and because there were few candidates from which to choose, boards of education had ". . . doubled teachers' salaries. Most of this increase came during the period 1919-1922."[14] Teachers' salaries reached their highest levels in 1930-31. But prolonged economic depression forced widespread salary reductions so that by 1934-35, the average teacher's salary was only about 85% of the 1930-31 level. By 1938-39 salaries had regained

two-thirds of the ground lost.[15] Salaries did not fully recover ground lost until after World War II.[16]

Besides the devastating effects of the Depression, two other factors, according to Weber, contributed during the 1930's and the early 1940's to a precarious salary situation. They were ". . . 1. The overproduction of teacher-supply by competing state-supported institutions and by private higher institutions offering like courses; 2. The district system (ward boards) of school administration which readily lends itself to a devastating competition, preventing the raising of both standards and wages."[17] Weber recommended in his textbook an Annapolis- or West Point-like selection system to choose persons to be trained as teachers and thus to remedy the problems cited. But such was not to be the case.

Salaries in 1930-31, the year they were the highest, ranged from a median low in small towns (population: 2,500-5,000) of $1,200 per year for junior high school teachers to a median high in the largest cities (population: 100,000+) of $2,800 for senior high school teachers. (The range for the median low $1,200 figure was $700-$1,900 per year.) By 1938-39 comparable median salary figures were $1,283 for junior high teachers and $2,672 for senior high teachers. In the recovery process, junior high teachers obviously fared better than senior high teachers. Elementary teachers' salaries were below those of their secondary school counterparts and in 1938-39 ranged from a median low in small towns of $1,096 per year to a median high of $2,217 in the largest cities.[18] In 1940 the average salary for all teachers was $1,325 per year.[19]

Although teachers' salaries and other public employees' salaries did not drop percentagewise as drastically as those of lawyers, physicians and surgeons, and dentists in the private sector, these private sector salaries never reached the absolute low levels of teachers' salaries.[20] Koos and others, commenting about teachers' salaries during the worst of the Depression, said teachers' salaries were miniscule but nonetheless remained fairly stable at least for the first years of the Depression. And, they continued to say that then as today, other professions (largely populated by men rather than women) were more attractive in terms of financial rewards and social status. Many of these professional positions, of course, required approximately the same amount of training and experience.[21]

They argued for a cost of living factor in any salary schedule and observed that the prevailing salaries for teachers assumed celibacy and no dependents; this they said caused teaching to be a "profession."[22]

Generally, the textbook writers argued for a single salary schedule for both elementary and secondary teachers. They deplored the "Blue Law" prohibitions of some teachers' contracts and the practice of some school districts in not hiring married women or in terminating women teachers when they did marry.[23] Because the teaching profession was overwhelmingly female, the textbook writers, urging correction of imbalance, advocated that men's salaries remain higher than women's--a common practice at the time.[24] (The 1933 National Survey of the Education of Teachers showed 75.8% of junior high teachers female and 65.1% of senior high teachers female.[25] Butts reported that in 1934, 80% of all teachers were female.[26]) The writers searched for a salary schedule formula by which to raise salaries; but lacking any real authority to raise monies, they had to settle for explicating principles of salary administration. The principles stated usually included the following: prepare a definite compensation plan, research average practice in surrounding communities, include a cost of living factor for your specific community, consider grade level taught, consider amount of training possessed, recognize length of experience, consider individual's competency, and do not ignore the criterion of supply and demand.[27]

As in the case of salary, textbook writers sought a formula by which to measure teachers' loads. One often repeated device was the relative weighting of a subject area against other areas. A table of the relative weights of subjects as devised by Lyon County (Kansas) High School teachers was cited by several writers.[28]

In junior highs and senior highs, typical classes were all larger in 1935-36 than in 1930-31. Only in kindergarten classes were enrollments smaller, reflecting a population decrease spurred by the Depression.[29] The writers made suggestions--eliminate small high schools, departmentalize grades 7-12 and assign teachers to subject areas vertically rather than by grades horizontally, and limit the number of subjects which a teacher was certified to teach. But not until schools could be better financed and the population decline could work its way upward through the grades was there to be much change.[30]

These teacher problems were not new, but they continued to occupy much space in school administration textbooks. And there were other problems as well. One of these concerned the small school and related to teacher preparation, salary, and load problems already mentioned.

Small and Rural Elementary Schools

There continued in the 1930's and 1940's textbook writers who addressed the work of the teacher-administrator. *Elementary School Organization and Management* (published in 1936) by Dougherty, Gorman, and Phillips and *How to Manage a Rural School* (published in 1942) by Culp are examples of books which continued to address a hundred-year-old school administration problem.[31] Both of these books obviously met an accepting audience, for Dougherty, Gorman, and Phillips published a revised edition in 1950 and Culp's book went into its seventh printing in 1947. These books addressed problems of the small elementary school and its teacher.

Dougherty, Gorman, and Phillips wrote: "While the book is *specifically* designed to be used in connection with the training and practices of the *classroom teachers*, yet the elementary school principal and probably the supervisor may find it useful."[32] It was not until the 1950 revised edition that a chapter on "The Elementary School Principal" was added.

Indicating that rural classes were taught by "raw recruits" mentioned earlier in this paper, Culp said of his *How to Manage a Rural School:* "This material was prepared for students in training. Much of the available material in Rural School Management was found to be too difficult for students who recently finished high school work. The writer has attempted to include necessary material and discard padding which was often included to make a large volume."[33] Culp in 1942 was Director of Rural Education, Northern State Teachers College, Aberdeen, South Dakota.

The problems of the small and rural schools were (1) that their teachers were less well prepared and had a shorter tenure than the large and city school teachers, (2) that the uppermost two elementary grades (7 and 8) were increasingly being taken over by the mushrooming secondary schools, and (3) that they generally were too small and too isolated to offer a socialization program increasingly being advocated and found in progressive schools. Yet the hun-

dreds of school boards for one- and two-teacher schools tenaciously held on to their schools.

Academic and professional preparation of rural teachers as compared to city teachers was woefully inadequate. If the same professional requirement of two to four years' training expected of city teachers were to have been adopted in rural schools, ". . . nearly 62% of the rural teachers would be forcibly divorced from their jobs."[34] Yet the demands on the rural teacher for a broader, more comprehensive education to meet the needs of diverse aged students made the teacher preparation problem even more vexing.[35]

Elementary schools, particularly small ones, were being reorganized from the top--by secondary schools--to meet some of their shortcomings. Since an emerging democratic philosophy called for a shift from administrative convenience to the child's interests, attitudes, and activities, secondary schools frequently reorganized grades 7-8 into a vertically integrated program to meet program needs that a one- or two-teacher school could not, or that a small grades 9-12 secondary school alone could not. Dougherty, Gorman, and Phillips commented that there was no typical elementary school pattern--elementary schools included nine or eight or seven or six years, some with kindergartens and some without them. Organization of elementary schools, they said, fell into two categories: ". . . (1) that concerned primarily with the activities within the classroom, and (2) that concerned with activities necessary for interclassroom relationships."[36] And it was the second category about which the one-room school was unable to provide the necessary socializing experiences.

Finally, school administration textbook writers were concerned that modern means of transportation were not being utilized for improved school programs. The old 1 1/2-mile walking distance dogma was being held too closely. Small rural schools ranged in size from 2 to 7 pupils; the average rural school had from 12 to 15 pupils. Combining schools and utilizing modern transportation held the possibility that a large enough pupil base could be established for a complete school program, including a socializing one.[37] Textbook writers wished to consolidate small schools into larger ones to overcome program isolation, but they also wished to avoid the perceived anonymity and crime of the larger community.[38]

Growth of Secondary Education

Whereas in 1900 only about 10% of the 14- to 18-year-olds in the United States were enrolled in high schools, by 1936 approximately 65%-70% were enrolled in high schools.[39] High school or secondary education became synonymous with the people's college--in fact, since the junior college's founding in 1902 at Joliet, Illinois, many secondary schools included grades 13 and 14, junior college. Junior high schools, founded about 1909-10 in California and Ohio, also swelled secondary school enrollments.[40] This tremendous expansion of secondary education spurred an administrative literature focus all its own.

In the twentieth century, the American public began to value extended schooling for their children and for themselves. From approximately 6,000 public secondary schools, 20,000 secondary school teachers, and a half million secondary school students in 1900, the numbers by 1936 had risen to almost 26,000 schools, 270,000 teachers, and 6 million students. By 1940 there were between 6.5 million and 7 million students enrolled in public secondary schools. This was nothing short of phenomenal growth.[41]

As secondary education grev in magnitude and importance, so did the principalship of ever-increasing-sized high schools. From an average size of 124 pupils in 1918, the high school had grown to an average of 233 in 1932, almost double in size.[42] The median size of high schools was reported in the National Survey of Secondary Education data as 721 pupils in 1932.[43] By 1940, Newsom, Langfitt, and others, 10 practicing principals of secondary schools, were impressed enough with the number of and the problems of large secondary schools that they wrote a textbook, *Administrative Practices in Large High Schools*. The 10 contributing principals were at schools ranging from a 1,050-pupil, 35-teacher junior high school to a 4,000-pupil, 160-teacher senior high school.

Secondary education had grown so fast not only in numbers, organization, and scope but also in programs and purposes that its fundamental functions were not delineated and accepted, even by school administrators and teachers. To help remedy this crisis of identity, the Committee on the Orientation of Secondary Education, Department of Secondary School Principals, National Education Association, published in 1936 the following list of controversial issues:

Issue I: Shall secondary education be provided at public expense for all normal individuals or for only a limited number?

Issue II: Shall secondary education seek to retain all pupils in school as long as they wish to remain, or shall it transfer them to other agencies under educational supervision when, in the judgment of the school authorities, these agencies promise to serve better the pupils' immediate and probable future needs?

Issue III: Shall secondary education be concerned only with the welfare and progress of the individual, or with these only as they promise to contribute to the welfare and progress of society?

Issue IV: Shall secondary education provide a common curriculum for all, or differentiated offerings?

Issue V: Shall secondary education include vocational training or shall it be restricted to general education?

Issue VI: Shall secondary education be primarily directed toward preparation for advanced studies, or shall it be primarily concerned with the value of its own courses, regardless of a student's future academic career?

Issue VII: Shall secondary education accept conventional school subjects as fundamental categories under which school experiences shall be classified and presented to students, or shall it arrange and present experiences in fundamental categories directly related to the performance of such functions of secondary schools in a democracy as increasing the ability and the desire better to meet socio-civic, economic, health, leisure-time, vocational, and

pre-professional problems and situations?

Issue VIII: Shall secondary education present merely organized knowledge, or shall it also assume responsibility for attitudes and ideals?

Issue IX: Shall secondary education seek merely the adjustment of students to prevailing social ideals, or shall it seek the reconstruction of society?

Issue X: Granting that education is a "gradual, continuous, unitary process," shall secondary education be presented merely as a phase of such a process, or shall it be organized as a distinct but closely articulating part of the entire education program, with peculiarly emphasized functions of its own?[44]

Differentiation of Administration

With growth in length and breadth of schooling expected by the public came also growth in the numbers and types of school functionaries. School administration was increasingly divided into distinct conceptual categories, and with a growing cadre of middle managers, school administrators at various levels tried to differentiate their roles and responsibilities. This differentiation effort was especially noticeable between superintendents and principals. Mention has already been made of the growth of a special body of literature concerning secondary education.

Administration--Curriculum-making--Supervision

Whereas older textbooks dealt with administration, supervision, and curriculum-making in one volume and as unitary or at least as closely integrated school administration tasks, textbooks of the 1930's and 1940's began to treat only one or two of these functions in a single volume.[45] This delimitation probably reflected the growing knowledge in school administration as well as the growing size of schools and school districts. To handle such growth, cate-

gories had to be established and topics addressed had to be delimited.

In 1934 Cox and Langfitt stated in the preface of their 674-page textbook: "This volume undertakes to deal with the administrative and supervisory functions of the high school principal and his assistants."[46] But by 1940 Koos and others in 662 pages, only, intended to deal with administration, organization, and management, as opposed to supervision and curriculum-making.[47] The effort to write a comprehensive text in school administration seemed abandoned. Instead, comprehensive administrator reading lists were included in texts, and specialized textbooks were published.

Examples of the former are lists given by Koos and others (1940) and Douglass (1945). Koos and others' literature list included 11 books plus 27 periodicals, 7 of which dealt almost exclusively with secondary education. Interestingly, Ellwood P. Cubberley and George D. Strayer were not included in the entries.[48] Douglass' list of professional reading for the high school principal was divided into three parts: (1) periodicals, 15 entries; (2) professional books, 55 entries in 10 categories (General Secondary Education, High School Administration, Methods of Teaching, Tests and Measurements, Guidance, Supervision, Curriculum, Activities, General School Administration, Psychology of Secondary Education); and (3) general reading, to include regular readings of at least one "high-grade, relatively reliable newspaper" (6 to choose from), one periodical from each of three classes (conservative or reactionary, liberal or progressive, middle-of-the-road or neutral: 10 to choose from), assorted small books and pamphlets, plus per year six or eight well-selected current books, a few books of current fiction and two or three older books of superlative caliber (the Bible to Sandburg's *Abraham Lincoln, The Prairie Years*).[49] Of course Douglass' own 600+ page volume should be read. In the extensive 31-page bibliography given at the end of the Douglass book, further reading is suggested. Interestingly again, Cubberley is not referenced at all (although he was cited on the relationship of principal to janitor in one chapter and was referenced in the professional reading list) and Strayer is referenced only once. These lists represent the then current professional sources and the typical topical areas of concern for the '30's-'40's administrator.

Specialized books in school administration could also be

found. Butterworth and Ruegsegger's *Administering Pupil Transportation* (197 pages) is an example of specialized books. It was based on Ruegsegger's dissertation and included what is in the book a 35-page scorecard for measuring effectiveness and quality of service of buses, routes, and transportation systems.[50] In other words, it was "how to" provide optimum service at minimum cost.[51] Further examples of specialized books were Johnston's *Administering the Guidance Program*, Magill's *Administering Vocational Education*, Pennock's *Administration and the Rule of Law*, and a series of yearbooks published by the University of Chicago Press as a result of the Annual Conferences of Administrative Officers of Public and Private Schools: *Administrative Adjustments Required by Socio-economic Change*, *Critical Issues in Educational Administration*, *Democratic Practices in School Administration*, and others.

Curriculum. Curricular emphases of the public school moved haltingly in this period from college preparation to life and living--citizenship, health, recreation, vocation.[52] The expanded school curriculum was not always taught in the same building under one roof, but it was offered perhaps in a specialized vocational school and in a neighboring high school. The 10 critical issues identified by the Department of Secondary-School Principals illustrates the uncertainty of a curriculum expanded beyond preparation for college. Cox and Langfitt commented that adolescents preparing for vocational occupations had been recipients of the most "realistic" secondary experience. This was because labor groups and business interests had lobbied hard for inclusion of world of work type courses in secondary curriculum. The obvious self-interest of these groups is in evidence when surveying the significant number of manual training, commercial, and science type high schools which grew and developed in the 1930's and 1940's.[53]

Certainly the effect of so-called Progressive Educators could be seen. A socialization program was advocated for rural schools,[54] an activities program was seen as a necessary part of a modern elementary school,[55] and the extra-curriculum including health and physical education assumed a greater and greater portion of school time at the secondary level[56]--all because schools were perceived to be embryonic societies and pupils were perceived to learn through directed living. The expanded curriculum brought with it new administrative titles--Curriculum Coordinator, Dean of Girls, Dean of Boys, Director of Vocational Guidance, Director of Citizenship, etc.[57] Generally there was a movement

away from strict curriculum tracks to broader, more integrated studies centered on a core of courses taken by all.[58]

Supervision

By analyzing the writings concerning supervision during this period, one can see a change from supervision as inspectorial and state-mandated to supervision focusing on the improvement of teaching and cooperatively undertaken by administrator and teacher.

Although others had written advocating cooperative supervision,[59] Ford as late as 1938 in his book's first chapter, "The Functions of Supervision," said, following conventional wisdom:

> The point has been reached when the state must organize an educational program in keeping with the times if school systems are to render the services expected of them. Not only must it organize such a program, but it must also follow the example of big business enterprises in seeing to it that the program is efficiently carried out--hence the necessity for effective supervision.[60]

To the end stated, Ford devised scorecards with 10-like quotients by which to rate teachers in the following areas: Environmental and Biological Background for Effective Study, The Assignment, Supervised Study, Controls of Conduct, Beginning Motor Control, Inductive-Deductive Procedure, Appreciation, The Activity Program, The Drill Procedure, The Project Methods, The Problem-solving Procedure, The Review Procedure, The Testing-Grading Procedure, The Technique of Socialization, The Lecture Procedure, General Principles Applicable to All Procedures, and Personality Traits. Thus a teacher could receive 100 on Personality Traits and 80 on Teaching Appreciation, etc.[61] Obviously the writer believed ". . . that practically every educational effort should be measured."[62]

Five years later (1943) Koopman, Miel, and Misner, in their chapter "The Nature of Educational Leadership," were advocating that consultative services replace supervision

and, to turn the tables completely around, that teachers should evaluate consultative services received.[63]

A middle ground between the two extremes just cited (and probably nearer actual practice) was taken by Koos and others when they said ". . . a study of teacher-rating plans and their actual results must convince anyone that a rating card cannot be a substitute for the rater's own extended training in values and techniques in all the subjects, his possession of a modern point of view in education, common sense, an analytical mind, and a sense of justice."[64] Other writers such as Cooke, however, turned the traditional supervisory tables also and devised performance checklists with which to evaluate principals, superintendents, and even school board members.[65] (Item Number 1 on the school board rating scale--*Recognizes Superintendent as Head of School System*, 0 points for "Refuses to recognize superintendent" through 45 points for "Often advises superintendent how to run schools" to 90 points for the school board member who "Never interferes with administrative affairs.")[66] Cooke also presented a rating scale by which pupils could evaluate teachers. Everybody could get into the act of cooperative supervision.

Superintendent-Principal Roles

Growth in numbers of schools (particularly secondary schools), in the size of school districts, and in an expanded curriculum brought increased pressures on a district's chief educational officer to seek administrative assistance. No longer could a superintendent in a city school system, for example, be the building administrator for every school in the district. Yet practice varied widely; in small villages, and there were hundreds of them, superintendents also functioned as principals while the principals of high school districts (e.g., California union high schools, Montana county high schools, Illinois township and community high schools) were in function superintendents reporting directly to a board of education.[67] Textbook writers belabored the increasing importance and responsibility of a separate office called principal, yet as was shown there were few unique responsibilities attached to the office. Therefore, the following discussion in this paper will treat the principalship and superintendency as unitary in academic and professional qualifications, certification, duties, and salary unless distinct differentiation was made in the textbooks reviewed.

Academic and Professional Qualifications

In 1934 it was reported that generally school administrators held bachelor's degrees. A few states (California, Maryland, and New York were given as leaders) required the master's degree to qualify for administrative positions.[68] Whereas in 1930-31 among secondary administrators approximately 4.7% had no degree; 47.0%, the bachelor's; 46.0%, the master's; and 2.2%, the doctor's; by 1940-41, 1.8% had no degree; 23.3%, the bachelor's; 70.4%, the master's; and 4.5% the doctor's.[69] School administrators obviously were rapidly attaining advanced schooling, and a trend toward the master's degree as a minimum was obvious.

The academic training received by school administrators was a typical liberal arts degree program with ". . . the gaps in training which seem unavoidable with the present elective system." Professionally, school administrators generally lacked training in the newer curricular fields such as vocational subjects, music, art, and physical education.[70]

Nevertheless, professional progress was being made as degree attainment rose. Douglass, at the close of the period under consideration, was so optimistic that he professed:

> It seems most probable that the high-school principalship of the near future, along with the school superintendency, will require not only distinctly superior mental and personal characteristics but continued technical and professional training, and affording responsibility and prestige on a par with that of the more generally recognized professions of medicine, law, and architecture.[71]

Certification

With rising academic and professional attainments came rising certification requirements. Regional accrediting associations and state universities that accredited high school programs certainly had a significant role in promoting and upholding certification minimums. In 1905 only one state had a special administrative credential (for superintendent).[72] By 1923, seven states distinguished

between teacher and administrator certificates, and by 1934, 27 states had separate teacher and administrator certificates.[73] The requirements for administrative certification in 1934 were typically college or normal school graduation, and one to five years' experience; over half of the states required 20 semester hours of professional courses (school administration and supervision being the most frequent), and 12 states specified that the professional courses must be graduate school work.[74]

Duties

It was in administrative duties that differentiation, though small, between superintendents and principals was reported in the textbooks. Interestingly, two textbooks reported studies that showed that the overwhelming majority of both superintendents and principals were continuing to teach in addition to performing their administrative duties.[75] And it was the administrative duty of appointing or nominating teachers that seemed to be most vexing for superintendents and principals. Sometimes local school board politics prevented either the superintendent's or the principal's selecting teachers.[76] Since superintendents had been longer in the business of selecting teachers, they evidently did not relinquish that duty readily when they actually held it. Elementary and secondary school administration textbook writers argued for the school principal's having at least advisory authority in the selection of school personnel, for the principal has ". . . intimate acquaintance with the positions to be filled."[77]

Realistically, administrative power was granted to the principal by the superintendent and the school board; and in effect, the superintendent controlled the duties of the principalship.[78] Thus the superintendent could make of a principalship anything from its being a clerical position to its having carte blanche concerning educative influences of a school. The critical administrative problem was ". . . to give the principal real professional responsibility and yet not so much independence as to endanger articulation with elementary and specialized schools."[79] It seemed clear that a principal should approach the school board through or with the superintendent.[80]

In practice the superintendency and principalship, where they were separate offices, were ill-defined. Ayer's extensive study reported by Koos and others attempted by means of

"A Checking List of 1000 Duties of School Administrators" to differentiate which office, superintendent or principal, was performing certain duties. In the nine categories of administrative duties in Ayer's study (I. 101 General Control duties, II. 169 Executive Management duties, III. 153 Business Management duties, IV. 86 Teaching Staff duties, V. 120 Pupil duties, VI. 70 Curriculum duties, VII. 79 Special Activities duties, VIII. 106 Instruction duties, and IX. 166 Special Services duties), it was found that principals were performing 85% of the same duties as superintendents. The only category in which there appeared much variation was business management, where principals performed only two-thirds as many duties as superintendents.[81] Cox and Langfitt tended to confirm this differentiation, for they report in the Preface of their textbook that ". . . building programs and educational finance are essentially the responsibilities of school superintendents and not of principals. . . ."[82] In sum, then, except for business management and closely related duties, superintendents and principals were by and large performing the same types of functions, thus making the areas of responsibility overlapping and possible sources of conflict.

Salary

Remembering that superintendents were often supervising principals in practice and vice versa, one can assume the principal's and the superintendent's salary was the same in many cases. Data were reported for 1930-31 (the year salaries were generally the highest for teachers and administrators), 1938-39, and 1942-43. See Table 3-1. Using elementary teachers' salary (1930-31) as a base of 100, principals' (junior and senior high included) salaries ranged 50% to 150% above the base.[83] The wider range of salaries at the junior high administrative level (see Table 3-1) was the result of a higher percentage of principals at that level in the smaller communities likely being women, whereas men were more likely to be principals in larger communities and to be paid more.[84] The writers thought administrative salaries were competitive with, though certainly not as high as, other professions and businesses requiring like amounts of ability, training, and experience.[85]

Douglass also reported superintendents' salaries for 1942-43. They ranged from $359 in the smallest villages

Table 3-1. Median Yearly Salaries for Junior High and Senior High School Principals by Smallest Sized (Pop. 2,500 - 5,000) and Largest Sized (Pop. 100,000+) Cities

Year	Position	Size		Relationship Small to Large Sized Population
		2,500 - 5,000	100,000+	
1930 - 31[1]	Jr. High Principal	$1,775	$4,500	150% increase
	Sr. High Principal	2,403	5,100	112% increase
1938 - 39[1]	Jr. High Principal	1,579	4,359	176% increase
	Sr. High Principal	2,156	4,758	121% increase
1942 - 43[2]	Jr. High Principal	1,757	4,422	152% increase
	Sr. High Principal	2,317	4,913	112% increase

[1]Compiled from Koos and others, p. 422.

[2]Compiled from Douglass, p. 550.

(pop.: 2,500-5,000) to $8,542 per year in the largest cities (pop.: 100,000+). Where there were superintendents separate and apart from principals in the smallest villages, superintendents were likely to earn approximately half again as much as the high school principals, but in the largest cities, superintendents were likely to earn almost three quarters again as much. For both the principalship and the superintendency, the more lucrative positions in the 1930's and 1940's were in the big cities. It is informative to note also that administrative salaries had not by 1942-43, the beginning of World War II, reached again the levels of 1930-31.

Finally, there had to be some less formal, survival relationships between a principal and the school district's central office. A glimpse into those relationships was given when Cox and Langfitt suggested that a principal's fiat was law unless and until the principal was overruled by the superintendent and/or the community.[86] It was also suggested that another relationship was "protector" of teachers from a central office supervisor who could snuff out originality and initiative in the classroom.[87] And at the end of a long book (674 pages) Cox and Langfitt gave "The Beginning Principal" two pieces of survival advice: your ". . . conduct must conform to the standards set by influential conservative citizens,"[88] and on the next to the last page of the text: ". . . there is a very high correlation between the administrative competency of a principal and his personal solvency."[89]

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION: PRACTICE AND CONCEPT

What was happening in American society surrounding the Depression and what was happening in the world during the 1930's and 1940's surrounding development of totalitarian versus democratic states could not be ignored. But it was not just these events that caused men--such as John Dewey, Boyd H. Bode, William H. Kilpatrick, George S. Counts--to advance new conceptions of the purpose of education and subsequently of the purpose of school administration. The crux of the matter was whether schools were to be ". . . the agency of society and as such should provide those experiences which will develop in youth the ideals, habits, and skills necessary to enable him to take his place in that society . . ." or whether schools were to be ". . . the pioneer of society and as such must assume a major share of responsibility for the development of a society which will provide the greatest good for all and produce individuals who are willing to work toward such an end."[90]

Reformulation of the Purposes of Education

The school administration textbook writer who gave a clarion call to reformulate the purposes of education as well as school administration was Jesse H. Newlon. His book *Educational Administration as Social Policy*, a volume in the American Historical Association's Investigation of the Social Studies in the Schools, was a marker event in the development of the profession and represents even today, against the backdrop of administrative efficiency experts, a pertinent rethinking of the field. Other textbook writers followed the lead of Newlon, but he was among the first if not the very first in administration to question sharply the then conventional wisdom.

Writing under the heading "The Social Purposes of National Systems of Education," Newlon stated that education in the United States had four basic purposes: (1) transmission of the culture, (2) education for citizenship, (3) social control, and (4) vocational efficiency.[91] In attempts to accomplish these purposes, ". . . the American school has, in large measure, been conducted as though it were educating individuals for a static society. A few have discerned the significance of the rapid social changes of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries."[92] Even the scientific method, which had succeeded in eliminating some obso-

lete materials and adding other new items to the school curriculum, had failed to be concerned with the basic social and educational purposes of schools and had not questioned the established order of things.[93] The essence of Newlon's criticism was

> that the American system of education has largely reflected laissez-faire individualism; that the scientific method in education, while making a desirable contribution, has at the same time tended to crystallize traditional educational procedures; that although a critical school of thought has arisen that would bring education more closely into contact with life and give it definite social direction, American education as a whole has, as yet, been but little affected by this new movement

that would fashion American education not only on ". . . the corporate character of modern life . . ." but also on ". . . an extension of the principle of democracy in the direction of planning our industrial and economic life under collective control."[94] These were bold words, obviously reflecting the thinking of "progressive educators."

Ten years later the words would not seem so bold as other school administration textbook writers joined Newlon in a call for reformulating the purpose of schooling. Dougherty, Gorman, and Phillips proclaimed that democratic socialization should be the unitary objective of education.[95] Koopman, Miel, and Misner observed: "In a present-day totalitarian state the individual is taught to cooperate with the state according to an authoritarian political theory. In a present-day democratic state the individual learns to cooperate with the state and with other individuals according to a democratic political theory."[96] With a reformulation of the purposes of education, a reconceptualization of school administration was in order.

Democratic Administration

In school administration textbooks, writers during the early years of the period began rather subtly and unobtrusively to suggest that teachers and administrators should cooperate in improving teaching through the supervisory

process and that the day of the autocratic administrator should be past.[97] By 1939 Cooke, sensing a change, entitled the first chapter of his book "Considering Teachers as Human Beings" and reported that business and industry had already discovered the salutary effects of attention to workers and their morale.[98] He viewed teacher participation in administration as ". . . an effective means of educating teachers in service."[99] Evidently professors of school administration in Missouri did not necessarily agree, for of teachers, superintendents and principals, and professors of school administration surveyed, the professors were the most conservative in their view of how much teachers should participate in administrative functions.[100]

Generally, school administration textbook writers after 1940 portrayed teachers as relative equals of administrators, as necessary to execute administrative policy, and as valuable contributors to cooperative procedures which, they said, produced better plans and programs than one person alone could. Because of these factors, ". . . teachers should share in the exercise of administrative control over the schools" and ". . . democracy should prevail in school administration. . . ."[101] Teacher participation meant democratic administration.

Koopman, Miel, and Misner in their *Democracy in School Administration* attempted to ". . . translate democracy into action," in other words, to offer a practice oriented, "how to" approach for extant democratic administration philosophy and theory.[102] Getting the foundation of their beliefs up front, they used an excerpted version of Dewey's "Democracy for the Teacher" as the textbook's frontispiece.[103] According to the writers, "Group policy-making is an essential element in democratic administration."[104] To this end, a policy-making individual school as well as a citywide committee system for enfranchising teachers in their democratic administration roles and responsibilities was proposed.[105] The writers' administrative credo was summarized in 12 Imperative Considerations given at the end of the text:

1. The substitution of group control for individual control

2. The implementation of purposes through appropriate internal organization

3. The utilization of group reactions in administration of education

4. The facing of social studies

5. The building of an organization broad enough to guarantee flexibility

6. The building of an organization functional enough to protect the teacher's energies

7. Provision for the needs of all groups simultaneously

8. Continuous appraisal as a guarantee of progress

9. Cooperation as a residue of a great variety of group activities

10. Participation as an aid to learning

11. Community improvement through a dynamic functional curriculum

12. The abolition of administrative vetoes, reservations, and sacred prerogatives.[106]

But there was not unanimous agreement that group procedures, teacher participation, and democratic administration would necessarily improve schools, teaching, or administration unless ". . . the school is benefited by (1) his own growth to greater effectiveness and (2) his improving the administration of rules, practices, or curriculum as the result of a greater understanding of them; and unless it can be shown that the advantages are greater than the disadvantages, such as consumption of staff time, slowing down of actions or decisions or maladministration to some degree or in some instances."[107]

Democratic administration had been proposed and an attempt at engineering it into action has been given. One estimate, however, put the actual practice of democratic administration in secondary schools at perhaps half of the schools, at least to some extent.[108]

Practice-Theory Dualism

Despite the reformulation of the purposes of education and the conceptualization of new functions of school administration, average practices--some like Newlon would probably say the conventional wisdom in new clothes--continued to influence heavily the formulation and practice of school administration. The scientific movement in education, the efficiency movement in school administration, and the school survey technique in public schools all tended methodologically to emphasize central tendency and average practice.

Typically, textbooks of this period would have chapters on buildings and grounds; equipment and supplies; layout of the principal's office; school office standards, procedures, and forms; school finance, and business administration; selection of the staff; organization of the curriculum; the daily schedule; personnel records; school publicity; teachers' loads; and improvement of teaching personnel in-service. Such chapters would be filled with numerous tables, lists, and charts indicating average practice in various sized communities in various parts of the country. Butterworth and Ruegsegger stated very plainly one purpose of their textbook on transportation to be the determination of prevailing standards of practice and said: "In this field, the 'ideal' is presumably that which is ahead of today's practice; the superior practice of a few systems today becomes the ideal toward which all systems are striving tomorrow."[109]

Surveys of all kinds almost always reported average practice, and there were several nationally important and influential ones cited. Among the surveys read widely by the textbook writers were the following:

1. Cooper and Koos, *National Survey of Secondary Education*, 1932
2. Evenden and others, *National Survey of the Education of Teachers*, 1933
3. *Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards*, 1938
4. Cocking and Williams, *The Education of School Administrators*, 1940

5. Lund, *Education of School Administrators*, 1941

Of the 20 chapters in *Administrative Practices in Large High Schools*, 18 were written by 10 practicing principals who reported practices in their respective high schools. Conforming with this emphasis was the intent of Koopman, Miel, and Misner in *Democracy in School Administration* when they indicated the book was for teachers who might want to know the experiences of practitioners in implementing democratic administration.[110] On balance, there was a relatively great emphasis on collecting, analyzing, and reporting average practice--the conventional.

Functions of Administration

What then were the functions of school administration? There were at least two schools of thought.

On the one hand there were those who followed Newlon and indicated the functions to be as follows:

1. To examine society critically and to participate with a community and lead in the formulation of social and educational policy[111]

2. To discover leadership and enable it to flourish[112]

3. To discover the social purposes of education and to move schools and schooling effectively toward those purposes[113]

4. To promote self-expression of all school personnel toward socially desirable purposes and values[114]

5. To organize school as a living laboratory in democratic political theory[115]

6. To cultivate an authority of reason to supplant an outmoded authority of position[116]

7. To interpret the community to the school and the school to the community so these each can understand the other's need[117]

Those, represented by Douglass, reluctant to relinquish the conventional wisdom indicated the functions somewhat differently:

1. To engineer the contributions of the educational scientist into useful forms[118]

2. To organize and plan the work of the school as efficiently as possible[119]

3. To supervise and lead in the improvement of teaching[120]

4. To manage the school day to day toward identified purposes of education[121]

5. To keep adequate records and accounts of school activities and functions[122]

6. To protect teachers and other staff who pioneer in improving practice[123]

7. To cooperate with the community and parents who are the stockholders and consumers of the school[124]

By the end of the period even the traditionalists no longer perceived schools as isolated institutions from their communities. Although the traditionalists would not agree with Newlon that the conventional forms and methods of school administration were relatively unimportant and sterile, they would agree with him that the school administration problems of the day were largely political and social and that preparation for service should not confine itself to the mechanical, technical, and pedagogical but rather should include a study of history, sociology, anthropology, political science, and philosophy.[125] School administration had almost become an applied social science.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

1. N. William Newsom and R. Emerson Langfitt, eds., *Administrative Practices in Large Schools* (New York: American Book Co., 1940), p. 1.

2. Samuel E. Weber, *Cooperative Administration and Supervision of the Teaching Personnel* (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1937), p. 17.

3. Ibid., p. 64.

4. Dennis H. Cooke, *Administering the Teaching Personnel* (Chicago: Benjamin H. Sanborn and Co., 1939), p. 304.

5. Weber, *Cooperative Administration*, p. 65.

6. Ibid., p. 17.

7. Ibid.

8. Leonard V. Koos and others, *Administering the Secondary School* (New York: American Book Co., 1940), p. 330.

9. Koos and others, *Administering*, p. 327; Cooke, *Administering*, pp. 121-122.

10. Weber, *Cooperative Administration*, pp. 127-129.

11. Koos and others, *Administering*, p. 327.

12. Ibid.

13. Ibid.

14. Koos and others, *Administering*, p. 415.

15. Ibid.

16. David V. Tiedeman, *Teacher Competence and Its Relation to Salary* (Cambridge, Mass.: New England School Development Council, 1956), p. vii.

17. Weber, *Cooperative Administration*, p. 173.

18. Koos and others, *Administering*, pp. 418-419.

19. R. Freeman Butts, *A Cultural History of Western Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955), p. 543.

20. Cooke, *Administering*, p. 284.

21. Koos and others, *Administering*, p. 418.

22. Ibid., pp. 429-430.

23. Cooke, *Administering*, pp. 70-72, 136.

24. Koos and others, *Administering*, pp. 346, 420-422.

25. Ibid., p. 346.

26. Butts, *A Cultural History*, p. 544.

27. Koos and others, *Administering*, pp. 423-441.

28. Cooke, *Administering*, p. 253, and Weber, *Cooperative Administration*, pp. 339-347.

29. Cooke, *Administering*, pp. 240-241.

30. Koos and others, *Administering*, pp. 406-412.

31. James H. Dougherty, Frank A. Gorman, and Claude A. Phillips, *Elementary School Organization and Management* (New York: Macmillan, 1936) and Vernon H. Culp, *How to Manage a Rural School* (Minneapolis: Burgess, 1942).

32. Dougherty, Gorman, and Phillips, *Elementary School*, p. vi.

33. Culp, *How to Manage*, p. 1.

34. Ibid., p. 9.

35. Ibid., p. 19.

36. Dougherty, Gorman, and Phillips, *Elementary School*, p. 21.

37. Culp, *How to Manage*, p. 9.

38. Ibid., pp. 13-17.

39. Koos and others, *Administering*, p. 1; also Phillip W. L. Cox and R. Emerson Langfitt, *High School Administration and Supervision* (New York: American Book Co., 1934), p. vii.

40. Butts, *A Cultural History*, p. 540; also see Newsom and Langfitt, *Administrative Practices*, p. 5.

41. Butts, *A Cultural History*, p. 542; also see Newsom and Langfitt, *Administrative Practices*, p. 6.

42. Cox and Langfitt, *High School*, pp. 9-10.

43. Koos and others, *Administering*, p. 7.

44. Newsom and Langfitt, *Administrative Practices*, pp. 10-11.

45. An example of a comprehensive textbook is Ellwood P. Cubberley, *Public School Administration* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1922).

46. Cox and Langfitt, *High School*, p. ix.

47. Koos and others, *Administering*, p. 6.

48. Ibid., pp. 9-12.

49. Karl R. Douglass, *Organization and Administration of Secondary Schools* (New York: Ginn, 1945), pp. 554-568.

50. Julian E. Butterworth and Virgil Ruegsegger, *Administering Pupil Transportation* (Minneapolis: Educational Publishers, 1941), pp. 51-86.

51. Ibid., p. 89.

52. Koos and others, *Administering*, p. 2.

53. Cox and Langfitt, *High School*, p. 20.

54. Culp, *How to Manage*, pp. 67-69.

55. Dougherty, Gorman, and Phillips, *Elementary School*, p. 10.

56. Koos and others, *Administering*, p. 130.

57. Cox and Langfitt, *High School*, p. 47.

58. Koos and others, *Administering*, pp. 14-17, 42-49.

59. Weber, *Cooperative Administration* (1937).

60. Frederick A. Ford, *The Instructional Program: Its Organization and Administration* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1938), p. 3.

61. Ibid., pp. 146-206.

62. Ibid., p. 50.

63. G. Robert Koopman, Alice Miel, and Paul J. Misner, *Democracy in School Administration* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1943), p. 55.

64. Koos and others, *Administering*, p. 370.

65. Cooke, *Administering*, pp. 208-222.

66. Ibid., p. 218.

67. Koos and others, *Administering*, p. 463.

68. Cox and Langfitt, *High School*, p. 50.

69. Douglas, *Organization*, p. 546.

70. Koos and others, *Administering*, p. 454.

71. Douglass, *Organization*, p. 546.

72. David B. Tyack and Robert Cummings, "Leadership in American Public Schools Before 1954," in Luvern L. Cunningham, Walter G. Hack, and Raphael O. Nystrand, eds., *Educational Administration: The Developing Decades* (Berkeley, Cal.: McCutchan, 1977), p. 59.

73. Koos and others, *Administering*, p. 457.

74. Ibid.

75. Cooke, *Administering*, p. 246; Koos and others, *Administering*, p. 464.

76. Cooke, *Administering*, pp. 28, 57-58; Weber, *Cooperative Administration*, p. 187.

77. Koos and others, *Administering*, p. 357; see also Dougherty, Gorman, and Phillips, *Elementary School*, p. 341.

78. Cox and Langfitt, *High School*, p. 47.

79. Koos and others, *Administering*, p. 463.

80. Douglass, *Organization*, p. 588.

81. Koos and others, *Administering*, p. 464.

82. Cox and Langfitt, *High School*, p. x.

83. Koos and others, *Administering*, p. 445.

84. Ibid., p. 422.

85. Ibid., p. 445.

86. Cox and Langfitt, *High School*, p. 53.

87. Ibid., p. 664.

88. Ibid., p. 669.

89. Ibid., p. 673.

90. Newsom and Langfitt, *Administrative Practices*, p. 1.

91. Jesse H. Newlon, *Educational Administration as Social Policy* (New York: Scribner's, 1934), pp. 54-58. Used with permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

92. Ibid., p. 64.

93. Ibid., p. 66.

94. Ibid., p. 69.

95. Dougherty, Gorman, and Phillips, *Elementary School*, p. 43.

96. Koopman, Miel, and Misner, *Democracy*, p. 20.

97. Weber, *Cooperative Administration*, pp. 327-328.

98. Cooke, *Administering*, pp. 1, 8.

99. Ibid., p. 318.

100. Ibid., p. 322.

101. Koos and others, *Administering*, pp. 481-482.

102. Koopman, Miel, and Misner, *Democracy*, p. v.

103. Ibid., pp. xiii-xiv.

104. Ibid., p. 50.

105. Ibid., pp. 76-121.

106. Ibid., p. 322.

107. Douglass, *Organization*, p. 573.

108. Ibid., p. 572.

109. Butterworth and Ruegsegger, *Administering Pupil Transportation*, p. 4.

110. Koopman, Miel, and Misner, *Democracy*, p. v.

111. Newlon, *Educational Administration*, p. 234.

112. Ibid.

113. Ibid., p. 252.

114. Koopman, Miel, and Misner, *Democracy*, p. 42.

115. Ibid., pp. 81 ff.

116. Koos and others, *Administering*, p. 172.

117. Ibid., pp. 635 ff.

118. Weber, *Cooperative Administration*, pp. 20-21.

119. Cox and Langfitt, *High School*, p. 69.

120. Ibid., p. 69.

121. Ibid.

122. Ibid., p. 67.

123. Ibid.

124. Ibid., p. 68.

125. Newlon, *Educational Administration*, pp. 252-264.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Textbooks

Brown, Edwin J. *Secondary School Administration.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1938.

*Butterworth, Julian E., and Virgil Ruegsegger. *Administering Pupil Transportation.* Minneapolis: Educational Publishers, 1941.

*Cooke, Dennis H. *Administering the Teaching Personnel.* Chicago: Benjamin H. Sanborn, 1939.

*Cox, Phillip W. L., and R. Emerson Langfitt. *High School Administration and Supervision.* New York: American Book Co., 1934.

*Culp, Vernon H. *How to Manage a Rural School.* Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co., 1942.

*Dougherty, James H., Frank A. Gorman, and Claude A. Phillips. *Elementary School Organization and Management.* New York: Macmillan, 1936.

*Douglass, Karl R. *Organization and Administration of Secondary Schools.* New York: Ginn, 1945.

*Ford, Frederick A. *The Instructional Program: Its Organization and Administration.* New York: Prentice-Hall, 1958.

Grow, Harry R. *The Development of Guiding Principles and Policies for the Administration of the Small School System.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1941.

Henzlik, Frank E. *School Administration and Education for Administrative Leadership in Towns and Villages.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1943.

Jaggers, Richard E. *Administering the County School System.* New York: American Book Co., 1934.

Johnston, Edgar G. *Administering the Guidance Program.* Minneapolis: Educational Publishers, 1942.

*Koopman, G. Robert, Alice Miel, and Paul J. Misner. *Democracy in School Administration.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1943.

*Koos, Leonard V., James M. Hughes, Percival M. Hudson, and William C. Reavis. *Administering the Secondary School.* New York: American Book Co., 1940.

Langfitt, R. Emerson, Frank W. Cyr, and N. William Newsom. *The Small High School at Work.* New York: American Book Co., 1936.

Magill, Walter H. *Administering Vocational Education.* Minneapolis: Educational Publishers, 1941.

Maxwell, Charles R., and L. R. Kilzer. *High School Administration.* Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Doran and Co., 1936.

*Newlon, Jesse H. *Educational Administration as Social Policy.* New York: Scribner's, 1934.

*Newsom, N. William, and R. Emerson Langfitt (eds.). *Administrative Practices in Large High Schools.* New York: American Book Co., 1940.

Pennock, James R. *Administration and the Rule of Law.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1941.

Reavis, William C. *Administrative Adjustments Required by Socio-economic Change.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941.

Reavis, William C. *Critical Issues in Educational Administration.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.

Reavis, William C. *Democratic Practices in School Administration.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Reeder, Ward G. *The Administration of Pupil Transportation.* Columbus, Ohio: Educators Press, 1939.

*Weber, Samuel E. *Cooperative Administration and Supervision of the Teaching Personnel.* New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1937.

*Witham, Ernest C. *Problem Studies in School Administration.* New York: Prentice-Hall, 1936.

B. Other Sources

Benjamin, Harold. *Emergent Conceptions of the School Administrator's Task.* November 12, 1938, Cubberley Lecture, Stanford School of Education. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1942.

Brubacher, John S. *A History of the Problems of Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Butts, R. Freeman. *A Cultural History of Western Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955.

Callahan, Raymond E. *Changing Conceptions of the Superintendency in Public Education,* 1865-1964. Cambridge, Mass.: New England School Development Council, 1964.

Cocking, Walter D., and Kenneth R. Williams. *The Education of School Administrators.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1940.

Cooper, William John, and Leonard V. Koos (dirs.). *National Survey of Secondary Education.* Washington, D.C.: United States Office of Education, Bulletin No. 17, 1932.

Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards. *How to Evaluate a Secondary School.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1938.

Edwards, Newton, and Herman G. Richey. *The School in the American Social Order.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1947.

Evenden, Edward S., and others. *National Survey of the Education of Teachers.* Washington, D.C.: United States Office of Education, Bulletin No. 10, 1933.

Good, Harry G., and James D. Teller. *A History of Western Education.* New York: Macmillan, 1969.

Lund, John. *Education of School Administrators.* Federal Security Agency. U.S. Office of Education, Bulletin

1941, No. 6. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1942.

Tiedeman, David V. *Teacher Competence and Its Relation to Salary*. Cambridge, Mass.: New England School Development Council, 1956.

Tyack, David B. "Pilgrim's Progress: Toward a Social History of the School Superintendency, 1860-1960." *History of Education Quarterly* 16, Fall 1976, pp. 257-300.

Tyack, David B., and Robert Cummings. "Leadership in American Public Schools Before 1954," in Luvern L. Cunningham, Walter G. Hack, and Raphael O. Nystrand (eds.), *Educational Administration: The Developing Decades*. Berkeley, Cal.: McCutchan, 1977, pp. 46-66.

*Textbooks reviewed in detail for this paper.

Chapter 4

A Return to Rhetoric: School Administration Texts 1946–1955

Fred D. Carver

This fourth of five papers depicting five distinct phases of textbook literature in school administration attempts to prove the theses that (1) the dominant emphases in educational administration textbooks were democratic administration and community schools; and (2) by the end of the period a quest for a new scientific basis for administration was apparent.

Surely, the shattering experience of the Second World War most certainly brought the world's attention to the democratic ethic among the communities of the world. The formation of the United Nations shortly after the cessation of hostilities was intended to build world peace through a world community.

The past history of educators and educational administrators had always been replete with a quasi-cult of "Americanism," democracy and preserving the virtue of freedom in America. That texts in school administration should begin to focus and elucidate on democracy and community schools is not surprising taken within the context of the post-war years.

A list of textbooks published in the years 1946-54 (inclusive) was developed (Appendix A). A sample of 12 of the textbooks was selected and examined with special attention given to the preface/introduction; books were selected for examination across the nine-year period (see asterisked books in Appendix A). While certain of the volumes examined could be considered specialized--e.g., elementary principal-

ship focus or human relation focus--excluded were texts that treated specialized task areas such as school finance (Mort and Reusser, *Public School Finance*, 1951) and subject areas such as health and physical education (Williams, Brownell, and Verbier, *The Administration of Health and Physical Education*, 1946). Also excluded were works whose titles identified them as exclusively treating supervision. The latter decision may be more questionable than the former. Supervision developed as the specialized area of administration concerned with the improvement of instruction. Almost all of the administration texts examined called attention to the improvement of instruction as the most important purpose of administration; certainly the elementary administration texts had that focus. On the surface, however, the inclusion of supervision texts in the analysis would have only added to evidence supporting the first thesis (note the titles of supervision texts in Appendix B).

Finally, not included as educational administration texts were seminal works which were used toward the end of the period and beyond as primary source material in the early days of the behavioral science movement: Simon's *Administrative Behavior* (1947); Lepawsky's *Administration, The Art and Science of Organization and Management* (1949); and Simon, Smithburg, and Thompson's *Public Administration* (1950). Other materials utilized in the preparation of the discussion that follows are to be found in Appendix C. Bibliographic citations for references identified in the narrative can be found in Appendix A or Appendix C.

Thesis One: Democratic Administration and Community Schools

The end of World War II is a distinct beginning of the '46-'54 period. There was no similarly logical event in 1954 to serve as the right bookend. The *Brown vs. Board of Education* decision was issued in 1954 and was a milestone in the use of social/behavioral science in the framing of decisions; it would, however, be overly opportunistic to "end the period" with the decision. The year 1954 (or any specific year) is an arbitrary ending date for a period in educational administration textbook literature that brilliantly reflects societal emphases. For all students and practitioners of educational administration during this period the challenge was to further democratize the operation of the public schools. This had implications for internal affairs as well as external relations since the

school's democratic mission was to serve society's needs; it had to be related to and in tune with community interests and activities.

A second international conflict in the twentieth century involving the United States with totalitarian governments as enemies during the fighting and subsequently as allies called to the fore the role of the public schools in preventing totalitarianism from developing and in maintaining a strong nation as protection from external forces as well. The growth of schools and school systems, in size and purposive scope, was an additional factor calling for something other than "business as usual" in educational administration. Kefauver, introducing the design for the Forty-fifth NSSE Yearbook, argued the need for a reorientation of educational administration away from scientific management and suggested the use of new concepts to emphasize the difference.[1] His new terms were educational administration as social statesmanship, leadership in educational administration, educational planning, and democracy in educational administration. Two quotes merit citing:

1. The term, social statesmanship, is made appropriate, too, by the bearing which educational policy and social policy have on each other. The achievement of important ends is dependent on the understandings, attitudes, and skills possessed by the people. In a democracy this dependence is especially critical. Likewise, educational policy has its origins in the society which it serves. The school is devoted to and engaged in the service of the basic democratic principles and goals, recognizing, at the same time, its service to the individual and to the progressive improvement of society.

   An important fact to be recognized, sometimes to the discomfiture of the educational administrator, is that educational policy is not a concern of the educator only. It is an appropriate and legitimate concern of people in all walks of life. . . .[2]

2. The concept of democracy in educational administration is now generally accepted. There are still differences of judgment as to

> the desirability of particular procedures, and it must be admitted that practice has not advanced as far as theory. The rise in the standard of preparation of teachers makes possible a more responsible role for the teacher. The movement is encouraged by the greater attention being paid to education for democratic citizenship and the belief that the practice of democracy is a more effective teacher than mere talk about it.[3]

Only in Mort (1946), Sears (1950), and Knight (1953) was there manifest evidence of the focus on democracy as the overriding emphasis. It is not that those three books were anti-democratic. The first two were more concerned with laying out conceptualizations of administration, Mort's from years of empirical research and Sears' by applying the administrative process approach from business and public administration exemplified in Gulick and Urwich (eds.), *Papers on the Science of Administration*. The third, Knight's, was a collection of 191 short "original sources of information in educational administration."[4] Only 14 of the selections were authored in the 1946-54 period. Within the administrative process focus, Sears states that the conception of education defined could "be inculcated only by teachers, principals, supervisors, and counselors who are themselves living as free individuals and working together cooperatively with mutual respect for one another, and with full consciousness of their own rights and their own duties to play a part in the government of the school."[5]

In a chapter entitled "Our Theory of Public Schools," Sears (1947) asserts that principles derived from an analysis of the administrative process would be "false and misleading if they are not in harmony with our theory of the state and of the public school as an instrument of the state for social control and social progress. For instance, in our form of state the concept of democracy forbids the use of authority in an autocratic way. Our organization, our controls, our directing, our planning, and our coordination must be democratic processes."[6] Yauch (1949) was writing with the elementary principal specifically in mind, but the author expressed the belief that it would be useful to administer in any role. He stated his case directly in the introductory chapter: "The present volume is an attempt to present practical suggestions concerning the ways in which the principal can provide teachers with democratic experiences."[7] That theme is carried through the book in chapters

such as "Group Leadership," "The Teacher's Meeting," and "The Management of Personal Relations" and includes specific advice/hypotheses, e.g., "Whenever any decision is made which involves others, these individuals should be included in determining the nature of that decision."[8]

Pittenger (1951) comments that the democratic philosophy was dominant in published literature and at convention discussions and that practice was being "penetrated by the movement at many points."[9] In the chapter entitled "A Functional Organization of School Personnel," the dual rationale for democracy is identified as organizational efficiency and assumed inherent rights; regarding efficiency, given a democratic institution established by a democratic society, better policies and execution will result, democracy is the necessary means for stimulating professional interest and growth, and children can learn to live in a democratic society only if that kind of environment exists for teachers.

In Chapters 5 and 6, Moehlman (1959) presents principles of organization that tie together democracy, education, and administration. A later chapter is built around the theme that the democratic community and school together are the strength of American public schools. Wahlquist (1952) identified three purposes for the test, the third (and theme of the book) being "to show how the democratic philosophy of education can be meaningfully implemented in practice."[10] As an aside, the authors distinguish between school administration and educational administration. The latter, which they prefer as the field describing term, they say, carries a dynamic connotation while the former connotes a static area of concern, namely the school. In noting the impact of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA), the chapter author comments that NCPEA promoted democratic school administration since its inception in Endicott, N.Y., in 1947 and that "every yearbook of this body (presumably through 1950 or 1951) has been centered in this new concept."[11]

The AASA yearbooks that essentially bookend the period (AASA, 1947, and AASA, 1955) are replete with the democratic ideal. The "administration sections" of the 1947 volume, Chapters 9-13, involved the identification of principles for the processes of democratic cooperation and then applied them in small, city, and metropolitan area school districts and at the state level. A leaning toward democratic administration would characterize the 1955 volume; the yearbook

was intended "to help people develop skills in the art of managing and working with people and maintain order and efficiency."

The community school emphasis in the textbook literature is more implicit than was the emphasis on democratic administration, although Melby (1955) represents a summation of the threads that run through most of the textbooks of the period. Most had a chapter or chapters devoted to the administration of a school or relations with the community. Almost all had an introductory section that placed the school in the context of the "democratic community" in a "democratic society." It was natural to link democratic administration with community school or, perhaps more appropriately, see the community and the school as inseparable parts. Indeed with democratic administration deriving largely from the political ideology of the society, it would have been ironic if community school or a similar concept had not emerged to remind the school of its immediate referent group.

There is some explicit evidence of the community school "rhetoric" in the texts as well. Sears (1947) makes the argument as follows in his chapter "The Administration of a School":

> 1. Should one plan his school in ways that tend to segregate children by social groups? When the word social is properly used that is precisely what modern school administration advises. This does not mean recognition of social classes. *It means that as nearly as possible a school must be for and of a real community.* [Italics added.] If the school is for a stockyards area, or an industrial section, or for a Jewish district, a Polish, Chinese, or an Italian district, or for a residential suburb, that does not in any sense mean that the pupils of any one of these groups are so segregated because they are socially below or above those of any other group. It means that each group is set off in order that the school may function in ways to fit the needs of all, adults and children, who belong to the group it serves.[12]

Moehlman (1951), as previously cited, developed a chapter around the theme that the community and school together are the strength of American public schools. He also includes a section on the use of the school for adult education. The 1946 NSSE (Henry, 1946) included a chapter stressing the importance of educational administration's bringing the school and community into close working relationships. Lawson (1953) begins his text not with the general societal context setting that characterizes many of the books but, (presumably) taking all that for granted, with principles and techniques for administering school-community relations.

It may be the case that the *community school* concept had not yet been accepted at the level of rhetorical usage as democratic administration in the period. Or it may simply be that the community school was such a much larger concept than administration or so pregnant with curricular implications that it was on the periphery of specialized concerns for textbook writers of the period. It was a never *concept* than democratic administration and could be easily subsumed for many administrators as a "given" within the societal context of the schools. As defined by Seay (Henry, 1953) it expanded the purposive parameters for the public schools--a vehicle for the schools to act as a powerful social force within a democratic society.[13] It was not that the *schools* would "build a new social order"; it was that the schools could cooperate with communities to develop the latent capacities and improve the quality of life for all in the communities. The NSSE Yearbooks toward the end of the period (Henry, 1953, and Henry, 1954) no doubt gave impetus to the movement. Another after the period ended (Henry, 1959) would rival Melby (1955) as the signal light for community education up to 1960.

Thesis Two: A New Quest

Textbooks examined revealed much less evidence that a search was beginning for a scientific basis for educational administration than that the philosophy/ideology of democratic administration dominated the period literature. Another summary judgment is that the evidence for a new quest was less pervasive than the more implicit and subtle support for the community school concept. Events of the '46-'54 period can be chronicled that were to later crash like thunder across educational administration and to have major impact on textbook and other literature. Hollis Moore, writing of the history of educational administration, iden-

tifies 1947 as the "date to mark the beginning of a 'ferment in school administration.'"[14] Little of the ferment found its way into the texts of the period, however.

In general, books at the end of the period differed little from those at the beginning. Immegart's description of the normative educational administration text of 1954 (presented in contrast to the typical text of 1974) would aptly describe much of the textbook literature of the period:

> The book began with an elaborate treatment of the context of education followed by a short treatment of the topic of administration. Administration in education was espoused in "democratic" terms and advanced as the way to bring democracy to organizations and the youth. Then chapters dealing with the tasks of administration were presented one by one. The book ended with a chapter or two on the challenge or future of education and re-emphasized the democratic administration charge voiced earlier for those needing reinforcement or who missed it in hurrying on to "how to do it." The context of educational administration was carefully documented with status data or survey data from secondary sources as well as the much used or respected general education literature. Research citations were largely limited to statistical studies from school districts, associations, state departments, or U.S.O.E. and few, if any, dissertations were quoted. The case for democratic administration was less documented and once into the task areas ("how to do it") documentation was scarce while experience, successes, and opinion abounded. Included were not only guidelines, principles, and steps but also charts, forms, and procedures. And the book sought to be a complete source for the administrator (or would be administrator), containing all he would need to or want to know in 600 or so pages.[15]

Two of the textbooks stand apart as integrated and "complete conceptualizations of administration." Mort introduced *Principles of School Administration* as a "set of

internally consistent principles covering the whole range of administration"; "a by-product of a search for a useful theory of educational dynamics--a theory that will put invention and the diffusion of invention of ways to meet changing concepts of purpose at the center and will modify the administrative structure and attendant procedures to meet the demands of the humanitarian and prudential principles and of empirical knowledge." It was not, however, a conceptualization based on the social/behavioral sciences as were the post-'54 frameworks. It was, rather, derived largely from a practice oriented empiricism. Sears applied a process conceptualization (organizing, controlling, directing, planning, and coordination) to "find a more fundamental basis than we now have for the criticism and improvement of administrative practice."[16] This work may be most important for its emphasis on the need to help people learn "*how to find out how to administer*" rather than training people "*how to administer*" and for the author's identification of psychology, sociology, anthropology, political science, law, administration (essentially public administration), and engineering and business administration as sources of subject matter to aid students.[17] The helping people learn "how to find out" emphasis was clearly a reaction to the how to do it/cookbook emphasis (that fit hand in glove with the democratic administration ideology). The identification of the sources of subject matter might reasonably be interpreted as a voice preparing the way for what was to (and did) come.

Wahlquist (1952) recognizes activity in the AASA and the inception of NCPEA in 1947 as important stirrings in the field. Moore cites those as two of the three significant events that started the ferment that surfaced in the literature after 1954--the other was a recommendation to the Kellogg Foundation from its education advisory committee that educational administration deserved Foundation support.[18] The converging of those forces led to the formulation and implementation of the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration in academic year 1950-51, the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration in 1955, and the University Council for Educational Administration in 1956. Out of this complex of crucibles bubbled the brew that was to become known concurrently as the behavior science and the theory and research movement in educational administration.

It is only with the 20-10 vision of retrospect that the textbook literature of the '46-'54 period can be seen as

reflecting the beginning of a search for a new scientific basis (considering scientific management as the first) for educational administration--a search for which the planning was well underway as the period ended. Given the pervasiveness of the commitment to the democratic ideology and its attendant community focus (the neighborhood school as the melting pot in American society), the difficulties in making that work, and the attention the public schools received as they grew in size and complexity, it is not surprising that a search was undertaken. That textbooks did not lead the mission nor signal its presence very loudly may merely be a commentary on the nature of textbooks--especially in a field as diverse and yet as common as educational administration--and, most especially, in the early stages of development of a field of study.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 4

1. Henry, 1946, Chapter 1.
2. Ibid., p. 3.
3. Ibid.
4. Gulick and Urwick, p. v.
5. Sears, 1950, p. 96.
6. Ibid., p. 109.
7. Yauch, 1949, p. 11.
8. Ibid., p. 208.
9. Pittenger, 1951, p. 16.
10. Wahlquist, 1952, p. iii.
11. Ibid., p. 25.
12. Sears, 1947, p. 370.
13. Henry, 1953, p. 2.
14. Griffiths, 1964, p. 11.

15. Immegart, 1875, p. 35.

16. Mort, 1946, p. viii.

17. Ibid., p. 501.

18. Griffiths, 1964, p. 15, and Moore, 1951, Chapter 1.

APPENDIX A

Textbooks in Education Administration, 1946-54

*Mort, Paul R. *Principles of School Administration: A Synthesis of Basic Concepts.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1946.

Otto, Henry J. *Organizational and Administrative Practices in Elementary Schools in the United States.* Austin: University of Texas, 1946.

*Reavis, William C. *Educational Administration.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946. 15th Annual Conference.

Fox, James H., and others. *School Administration, Principles and Procedures.* New York: Prentice-Hall, 1949 (1947).

*Sears, Jesse B. *Public School Administration.* New York: Ronald, 1947.

Hilton, Ernest. *Rural School Management.* New York: American Book Co., 1949.

*Yauch, Wilbur A. *Improving Human Relations in School Administration.* New York: Harper, 1949.

Yeager, William A. *Administration and the Pupil.* New York: Harper, 1949.

Dougherty, James H., and others. *Elementary School Organization and Management* (rev. ed.). New York: Macmillan, 1950.

*Sears, Jesse B. *The Nature of the Administrative Process.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

Skogsberg, Alfred H. *Administrative Operational Patterns.* New York: Metropolitan School Study, Bureau of Publications, 1950.

Elsbree, Willard, and Harold J. McNally. *Elementary School Administration and Supervision.* New York: American Book Co., 1951.

Hagman, Harlan L. *The Administration of American Public Schools.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951.

*Moehlman, Arthur B. *School Administration.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.

*Pittinger, Benjamin R. *Local Public School Administration.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951.

Reeder, Ward G. *The Fundamentals of Public School Administration* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan, 1951.

Campbell, Clyde M. *Practical Applications of Democratic Administration.* New York: Harper, 1952.

*Wahlquist, John T., and others. *The Administration of Public Education.* New York: Ronald, 1952.

Edmondson, James B., Joseph Roemer, and Francis L. Bacon. *The Administration of the Modern Secondary School.* New York: Macmillan, 1953.

*Knight, Edgar W. *Readings in Educational Administration.* New York: Holt, 1953.

*Lawson, Douglas E. *School Administration.* New York: Odyssey Press, 1953.

Ovsiew, Leon. *Emerging Practices in School Administration.* New York: Metropolitan School Study Council and Cooperative Program in Education Administration, 1953.

*Douglas, Harl Ray. *Modern Administration of Secondary Schools.* Boston: Ginn, 1954. (Revision of the 1944 *Org. & Admin. of Sec. Schools.*)

Elsbree, Willard S., and E. Edmund Reutter, Jr. *Staff Personnel in the Public Schools.* New York: Prentice-Hall, 1954.

Greider, Calvin, and William E. Rosenstengel. *Public School Administration.* New York: Ronald, 1954.

Otto, Henry J. *Elementary School Organization and Administration* (3rd ed.). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954.

*Reavis, William C., and others. *Administering the Elemen-*

tary School--A Cooperative Educational Enterprise. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1954.

Shane, Harold G., and Wilbur A. Yauch. *Creative School Administration in Elementary and Junior High Schools.* New York: Holt, 1954.

Weber, Clarence A. *Personnel Problems of School Administrators.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.

Yeager, William A. *Administration and the Teacher.* New York: Harper, 1954.

*Sample books.

APPENDIX B

Supervision Texts, 1946-54

Adams, Harold P., and Frank G. Dickey. *Basic Principles of Supervision*. New York: American Book Co., 1953.

Bartky, John A. *Supervision as Human Relations*. Boston: Heath, 1953.

Boardman, Charles W., Harl R. Douglas, and Rudyard K. Bent. *Democratic Supervision in Secondary Schools*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1953.

Briggs, Thomas H. *Improving Instruction Through Supervision*. New York: Macmillan, 1952.

Melchoir, William Tobias. *Instructional Supervision: A Guide to Modern Practice*. Boston: Heath, 1950.

Spears, Harold. *Improving the Supervision of Instruction*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1953.

Wiles, Kimbal. *Supervision for Better Schools*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1950.

APPENDIX C

Sources Other than Educational Administration Textbooks

AASA. *Schools for a New World.* Twenty-fifth Yearbook of the AASA. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1947.

AASA. *Staff Relations in School Administration.* Thirty-third Yearbook of the AASA. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1955.

Campbell, Roald F., "Educational Administration: A Twenty-five year Perspective," *EAQ.* VIII (Spring 1972), pp. 1-25.

Campbell, Roald F., and Russell T. Gregg (eds.). *Administrative Behavior in Education.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957. (Foreword and Chapters 2 and 3.)

Griffiths, Daniel E. (ed.). *Behavioral Science and Educational Administration.* Sixty-third Yearbook of the NSSE, Part 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press for the Society, 1964. (Chapters 1-3 and 13.)

Henry, Nelson B. (ed.) *Changing Conceptions in Educational Administration.* Forty-fifth Yearbook of the NSSE, Part 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press for the Society, 1954.

Henry, Nelson B. (ed.). *Community Education: Principles and Practices from World-Wide Experience.* Fifty-eighth Yearbook of the NSSE, Part 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press for the Society, 1959.

Henry, Nelson B. (ed.). *The Community School.* Fifty-second Yearbook of the NSSE, Part 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press for the Society, 1953.

Immegart, Glenn L. *The Study of Educational Administration 1954-74: Myths, Paradoxes, Facts, and Prospects.* Paper prepared for the Ohio State University-UCEA Career Development Seminar, April 1975, 69 pp.

Melby, Ernest O. *Administering Community Education.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1955.

Moore, Hollis A., Jr. *Studies in School Administration: A*

Report on the CPEA. Washington, D.C.: AASA, 1957. (Chapter 1, especially.)

Chapter 5

Factualism to Theory, Art to Science: School Administration Texts 1955–1985

Thomas E. Glass

In the early 1950's a sizable number of education administrators began to discern the need for a theory of administration. Many of these administrators had been exposed to the rapidly expanding body of theory in the behavioral and social sciences. It was not difficult to visualize a transfer of this knowledge to the field of educational administration. And, this quickly would realize the need for theory which would provide practitioners as well as researchers the tools of scientific inquiry. The traditional emphasis on "what is" versus "what ought to be" did not provide to administrators a tool by which to describe, explain, and predict phenomena associated with the management of the educational enterprise. Most of the early enthusiasts for development of educational theory were professors of educational administration, but also significant was the interest of several prominent sociologists and social psychologists.

The reality of the nuclear age, the baby boom, and changing philosophies in the society had done much by 1955 to unalterably change the structure of many social institutions, including the school. The traditional role of the school as the dispenser of basic skills for the masses with limited advanced academic training for the minority had been radically changed as high school graduation rates climbed and increasing numbers of high school graduates attended colleges and universities. Also, a burgeoning technology was working alongside societal changes in producing a school system of increased complexity which necessitated a management system extending beyond repeated applications of tax-

onomies of "school management principles." The evolving complex society called for management and conceptual tools designed to lead large groups of students and staff in a task of formal socialization to a changing technological world. The little red schoolhouse in the country was fast becoming a relic of the past. And, the "schoolmaster" who kept school had finally been replaced with an administrator who managed human and fiscal resources in the institution known as the school.

The decade of the 1950's also saw a virtual explosion of textbooks in educational administration. Especially, in the second half of the decade the number of titles began to rapidly increase, and the 1960's brought on a significant number of general texts as well as the specialized type. A rough estimate would be that the 1960's produced about three times the number of titles as had been published in the 1950's. The 1970's continued the rapid publication pace of texts which tailed off in the 1980's, a period of economic recession, and perhaps a recession in academic production in the field of educational administration.

In the 25 years 1955 to 1980, a clear, discernible trend can be seen in a movement from factualism found in compendiums of "principles" to a quest for theory and theory application. However, this does not mean that all text writers quickly and fully moved into the new theoretical movement which was dominated by professors influenced by the behavioral and social sciences. Such is not the case, and even into the late 1970's and 1980's some writers only grudgingly acquiesce to social science inspired administrative theory. Administrative theory in a combination with "age-old" principles of school management and cookbook recipes often lie side by side in many general textbooks.

In fact, the current philosophical division of educational administration programs in higher education as well as in the literature began to develop during the early part of this period. As social science theory began to invade the teachings of many professors of educational administration, others resisted "impractical theories" as being retardants to training successful administrators. The lack of communication between the two groups as well as an appreciation of both for theory and practical training has led to serious divisive factionalism in many higher education programs, especially since the development of the field of policy study.

In essence, the quest for development of educational theory and its application to school management in some respects has been a divisive event. However, administrative philosophies of what "ought to be" had to be in a scientific age replaced with a more scientific approach. Today, the conflict among professors of education administration is not about legitimacy of theory but whether or not students should be primarily taught "about" administration or "to do" administration. In what doses and in what environmental settings is the source of conflict.

In the years between 1955 and 1985 educational administration was clearly in a transition phase between traditional orthodoxy of implementation of a set of principles elucidated in "bibles" to a base of theoretical inquiry regarding the organization of the school. However, the ascendancy of organization theorists was not and is not total in the textbook literature.

In reviewing and assessing the textbook literature of the 1955-85 period the importance of the emergence of administrative theory cannot be overstated. This movement decidedly did change the content and approach of the leading texts of the period.

The selection of texts to be revieved as being representative of the 30 years encompassing this paper was a long and arduous task due to several complicating factors, namely, the existence of a large number of works in multiple editions and the tendency for specialization in a narrowly defined topic area. Several decisions had to be made in order to make the task manageable due to the large number of volumes available for reviev. First, the decision was made to restrict the review of this paper to general type texts in educational administration which might be used in beginning stages of the academic education of administrators. Again, it must be noted that this paper is a reviev and analysis of textbook literature and not that of scholarly works. From a total perusal of over a hundred texts of all types it was found that general texts did generally reflect a hypothesis of a movement from factualism to theory-based administration, at least to some degree. The single significant decision regarding the review was to exclude from analysis specialized texts such as those found in law, finance, community relations, personnel, supervision, and even planning. Generally, the specialized texts are technical types of works, oftentimes with a theoretical base borrowed from another discipline bu. generally dealing with

a specific role or task in administration. This is not to say such works are not important; they are, but a demarcation line had to be established, and with only several exceptions are they mentioned in the body of this paper. Such is also the case with scholarly types of works which are mentioned only within the context of influencing a general type text.

Criteria used to select the dozen textbooks reviewed were threefold: first, a consensus among colleagues queried as to what were the important works of the period; second, the actual numbers of volumes sold in their various editions; and third, which seemed to have a significant effect on the profession and practice as well as the writing of later works by other authors. The thesis is advanced that a definite trend toward use of "administrative theory" can be found in the period's general textbooks and secondly, a lessening of the use of compendiums of "principles." In brief, there is increased emphasis in texts to describe, explain, and predict administrative roles and actions.

As mentioned earlier, over a hundred works were surveyed in order to establish the final list of 12 representative works to be analyzed in detail. It is certain the 12 selected texts will not meet with approval of all scholars as being leading and representative works of the period. This of course is a matter of personal preference; however, the 12 do represent major publishing trends. Many have been published in multiple editions which denote their lasting power. However, this should be taken advisedly, as professors using the texts often based their adoption according to their own biases. This might mean a professor in educational administration, not being a strong adherent or proponent of theory application, might choose a text more based in factualism and practical administration. There appear to be more than several of those types in the list. Also, included are several works which are heavily theory-laden and which for the most part have not sold widely across the country. However, their influence has been significant in terms of the writing of later works by different authors. Lastly, somewhat extensive treatment is given to two works which are not readily assigned the label of general texts in administration. In effect, they are brief works on theory and probably furnished the base or the inspiration for a large number of works in the period 1955-1985. They are not included among the selected dozen.

The works screened and surveyed to be representative of

the field of educational administration during the periods of its greatest expansion and development are the following, in chronological order:

1. *The Public Administration of American School Systems*, 1952, Van Miller 1972

2. *Public School Administration*, Grieder, Pierce, and Jordan, 1954, 1961, 1969

3. *Educational Organization and Administration*, Morphet, Johns, and Reller, 1959, 1967, 1974, 1982

4. *Administration of Public Education*, Knezevich, 1962, 1969, 1975, 1984

5. *The Organization and Control of American Schools*, Campbell, Cunningham, Nystrand, and Usdan, 1965, 1970, 1975, 1985

6. *Educational Administration as a Social Process*, Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell, 1968

7. *The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration*, Sergiovanni and Carver, 1973

8. *Theoretical Dimensions of Educational Administration*, Monahan, 1975

9. *Educational Administration: An Introduction*, Kimbrough and Nunnery, 1976

10. *Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice*, Hoy and Miskel, 1978, 1982

11. *Human Behavior in Educational Administration*, Newell, 1978

12. *Educational Administration and Organizational Behavior*, Hanson, 1979, 1984

The reader can easily perceive that many of the 12 works have appeared in more than several editions. Sometimes the revisions made between editions have been substantial and sometimes not. Often, the original author has picked up co-writers for later editions. In some cases, original authors produced later editions with co-writers and then branched off into a new work in the field at a later time. Whether

or not a work has been printed in multiple editions has been largely determined by the philosophical bent of the particular educational administration program in which it is to be used. A guess would be that theoretical works largely based in the social and behavioral sciences would be most used in programs somewhat directed at the graduate student who will be either a researcher or professor, not necessarily a practitioner. However, this would not be true in all cases. Obviously, the professor trained and interested in the social sciences would more often than not choose a more "academic" text rather than a more "practical" one. Also, perhaps an educational administration program at a smaller institution, primarily concerned with the training of master's level students, might be less interested in a text based in the social sciences. Again, the professor's academic background and his/her program's direction might well dictate text selection, thus also sales.

The previous paper in this book emphasizes a return to rhetoric, including the postulation that "democratic themes" and "community" became the dominant themes in textbook literature after World War II. Indeed, the graduate students in educational administration in the 1950's were subject to what might be called a bit of "educational propaganda," but still evident is the trend toward cookbooks and "taxonomies" of good practices. However, there was a bit of stirring about for the development of theory. These initial quests for an administrative theory base are exemplified by Sears and Mort, two very popular writers of the 1940's and '50's. Sears in *The Nature of the Administrative Process* ascribes his "concept of administrative theory" to derive mainly from the field of business which is largely shaped from the nature of its enterprise. He indicates that by studying the administrative function and processes, organization assumptions can be developed which will lead to an optimum direction of that organization.[1] This very popular work cannot be called a compendium of preferred practices; in fact, the title uses the word "nature"--perhaps this might have been better put as "psychology." To read Sears is to read the contemporary management works of the period such as Chester Barnard's *Function of the Executive*, which, even though published in 1938, furnished most of the basis for management study until that field, too, became heavily impacted by the behavioral sciences. Sears most definitely was a devotee of contemporary management school thought of the period as applied to the school organization. Sears' work had a significant impact on many graduate students in terms of sparking their interest in studying the school management

function from the perspective of quasi-organizational theory.

Another strong emphasis in educational administration for a long period of time was the work of Paul Mort. His "common sense" approach was perhaps the keynote of his times. In general, he advocated strongly and eloquently a system of value concepts. In his best-known work, *Principles of School Administration* (the emphasis being on Principles), a system of 14 principles was discussed in great detail including reasons why they should be implemented in the management of schools. Mort, too, probably unknowingly, was sowing the seeds of administrative theory by his process of deductions concerning the selection of techniques called principles which, if tried, would be effective tools of administration.[2] Even though the works of Sears and Mort have been assessed in earlier sections of this book, it is still proper and relevant to mention they were still strong influences in the textbook literature. And, the preceding two works were forecasters of what was to come very shortly to the field of thought and subsequent publication.

It is reasonable to assume a two- to five-year time lag between innovation in a field and its appearance in general textbook literature. Thus, events occurring in educational administration in 1955 would not be reflected in the textbook literature until about 1960. This was indeed the case as several crucial events occurred in the 1955-60 period which would subsequently affect the direction and content of many texts for the next several decades.

In 1955, the Kellogg Foundation awarded the University of Chicago a large grant to be used for the development of a program to increase research and a body of theory regarding the administration of the public schools. The task of the development of a theory of administration was also undertaken at approximately the same time by a group headquartered at George Peabody College.[3] Soon these groups were sponsoring meetings and seminars for the exchange of ideas and papers. Also, key members of the centers began producing works which would several years later evolve into educational administration texts.

Among the early theorists were Daniel Griffiths of Teachers College and Andrew Halpin of the Claremont Graduate School. Griffiths, especially, might be referred to as the true "father" of educational administrative theory. His

small 1959 work entitled *Administrative Theory*, although not a primary general text, has been required reading for literally thousands of graduate students. Although I have not included it among the 12 general texts, a strong case can be made that its impact as a secondary or supplemental text has been substantial. In this small book Griffiths traces the history of attempts at theory in administration and more importantly as to what theory is, is not, and should be in educational administration.[4] Importantly, Griffiths outlines steps necessary for the development of theory and how it should be used in research and day-to-day administration. An outline of theory and its impact on decision making is contained and is later expanded in *Administrative Theory in Education*, a collection of papers edited by Andrew Halpin. This second of what might be called basic books on the road to administrative theory was the outcome of a conference held at the University of Chicago in 1957 under aegis of the then newly formed University Council for Education Administration along with the Midwest Administration Center, already mentioned as being the vehicle for the Kellogg Grant to the University of Chicago.

Halpin in the first chapter sets forth to again explain the need for and value of administrative theory. He also pleads for those in educational administration not enamored with theory being the basis for study and application to give it a fair hearing. However, he does castigate the profession a bit, quoting from an AASA publication:

> . . . the bulk of the studies reviewed are exhortations, how-to-do-it prescriptions, catalogues of opinion, or normative "status" investigations which do not permit us to generalize beyond the immediate data.[5]

Halpin also makes the key statement about what has been one of the most significant uses of theory in education administration in the future several decades, namely a function of theory should be to develop testable hypotheses.[6]

In brief, Halpin's lead article in the book was to call for development and use of theory in administration. This, in his opinion, would best be accomplished by administrators both in the field and in higher education becoming in effect social scientists and using appropriate methodology and tools. The difficulties of developing an administrative

theory in administration are also well stated by Halpin and in fact appear to a degree in the final chapter of the book written by Roald Campbell, who states in his mind what the three main purposes of schools *should be*: (1) develop critical thinking skills, (2) establish basic literacy, and (3) provide a vehicle for social mobility.[7] Campbell continues on in his thinly veiled attempt at citing all of the differences and problem areas in educational administration which would make it difficult if not impossible to draw general conclusions regarding wide-range theories. He sometimes slips into the "what ought to be" syndrome.

Administrative Theory in Education is mentioned because it was the result of the Midwest Conference, which surely had a significant impact indirectly on many later authors of texts. Halpin in his 1966 work entitled *Theory and Research in Administration* took what his publishers declared to be "The New Movement" in the training of educational administrators a step further and attempted to provide the field with a textbook in educational administration theory. The result was not a work which could be equated as a general text. However, its scholarly nature is evident, and Halpin along with Griffiths certainly provided the impetus for future text writers who would follow their lead in emphasizing theory and use of the tools of social and behavioral science.

A juncture has now been reached in the development of general textbooks. The impetus for change in the form of the call for and use of theory in administration had been sounded by Griffiths, Halpin, Parsons, and others. Did text writers indeed heed the call for a more scientific approach to administration? And, more importantly, did practitioners heed the call and begin to think not only of administering their buildings and districts but also how as social scientists they might change organizational structure and behaviors? The answer to the first query can be somewhat answered by examination of a representative number of textbooks. The second question is far more difficult to answer with any degree of certainty. This is perhaps best left to other researchers dealing with administrative role behaviors.

In the next several pages a dozen general type textbooks will be reviewed and commented upon in chronological order. A general appraisal will be made upon each and where it fits within the following three *trends*:

1. A strong emphasis is on theory development and use of social and behavioral science tools, models, techniques, methodologies, and theory.

2. A reliance on time proven "principles," "taxonomies," and versions of "what is" versus "what ought to be," the traditional approach. Expert opinion.

3. A mixture of the traditional versus the emerging administrative science based on the social and behavioral sciences. Some of these works can be seen to be willing mergers and others of a more grudging type.

The reader will be able to see that chronology is not necessarily a significant factor in determining into which category a text may fall.

Along with Mort and Sears, Van Miller of the University of Illinois was a very popular text writer during the 1950's and 1960's. His approach in *The Public Administration of American School Systems* by the Macmillan Company is that of a traditional generalist. The first edition of this book appeared in 1952 with Willard Spalding as a co-author and reappeared in 1959 with Spalding, in 1965 with Miller as sole author, and again in 1972 with George Madden and James B. Kincheloe as co-authors. One of the reasons this work was selected is due to the various editions and number of co-authors. To put it succinctly, the book did change over the years until an almost new book emerged. However, the overall approach did not significantly change, that being a good descriptive account of public schools in the United States. In fact, Miller and Spalding avoid many of the pratfalls of previous writers by never expressly saying what is good practice and what is not good practice. They very adequately explain the multitude of functions which every school district must perform every day, every week, and every month of the year. And, when they do recommend, it is done in a very tactful and subtle manner. In the 1972 edition as well as in 1965, a final chapter is devoted to discussion of the profession of education administration. In the 1965 edition Miller alone discusses the development of the Midwest Center, the University Council of Education Administration, and other groups attempting to further the professionalism and status of educational administration. By the 1972 edition another part is added to include the development of administrative thought. This is indeed a

very long way from the first edition in 1952! Whether or not Miller wrote this final chapter is a very good question, but nonetheless Miller and his co-authors were conceding to changes in the field. Also, to their credit, they are perfectly honest about their book, saying in an introductory note:

> . . . The book provides the student with a challenging exercise in reconsidering his present information and opinions, in seeking additional information and expert opinion, and in organizing his views into a consistently defensible, though flexible, understanding of the public administration of American school systems. . . . This book is intended to develop the student's perspective. It is not a scientific treatise on school administration in the United States, nor is it a guidebook on how to administer schools. . . .[8]

Indeed the book is a collection of subtle expert opinion, presumably by experts who have tried out the opinions expressed in the environments so well described. And, most assuredly, the book is not a scientific work based on sound theory, explanation of phenomena, and predictive postulates. However, to dismiss this book as having little value would be inappropriate. The last chapter does indeed describe the then current trends in theory development and does not pretend to be what it is not. Most important, it is essential for practicing as well as potential administrators to read the function descriptions and the expert opinion which is contained in such works. There is a place in the literature for descriptive writing, perhaps more so than expert opinions. Function analysis is legitimate, and that performed in Van Miller's principal work is well done and should still be of interest today. It is no wonder the book in its four editions was widely used and served as replacement for previous texts by Sears, Mort, and Cubberley. Of the three categories it can be classed as traditional, even with the chapter regarding development of management theory. The role of the social sciences does not emerge, but nonetheless the "New Movement" of Halpin did, if in a small way, impact the last edition.

The next work reviewed is a three-edition text widely used particularly in Midwest schools in the late 1950's and

1960's, *Public School Administration* by Calvin Grieder, Truman Pierce, and K. Forbis Jordan. This book must have been a favorite of the traditionalist as it is a descriptive type of work with pages and pages of expert opinion. Where Van Miller's function descriptions were extensive, these authors spend far less time in describing functions and problems associated with their performance. This book is largely a "common sense" approach to administration so advocated by Sears. The expert opinion approach is squarely the overall theme. It tells a little bit about a whole lot of tasks and functions which must be performed in a school district. Some opinions expressed by the authors include such platitudes as: ". . . the authors firmly believe that the school district board has proved to be one of the chief contributors to the progress of education, and that it should be preserved and strengthened. . . ."[9] Who can argue with that expert opinion?

This book is the most simplistic of the dozen works surveyed and the one which falls most easily into the traditionalist category. It was selected primarily because of its three editions and popularity. It is simplistic and easily readable by the novice in administration. It is divided into major fields of administration and exemplifies exactly a general work of the period. In summary, it is more "cookbookish" than texts written by Jesse Sears and Van Miller.

Perhaps the most classic of all texts which are non-theory oriented, but descriptive and in essence tells the most *about* education administration is perhaps the all-time seller in the field, *Educational Organization and Administration: Concepts, Practices, and Issues* by Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller. The four editions of this work begin in 1959 and conclude with the most recent in 1982. In the 23 years the book has been in print it has been widely used across the nation. It is the writer's opinion that more copies have been sold than any one of Cubberley's individual works. The format as well as the purpose of the text has stayed constant but with changes over the years. As concepts, practices, and issues have changed, so have some of the chapters in *Educational Organization and Administration.* An example would be the 1974 edition, which contains a chapter on accountability which of course was a pertinent issue in education of the 1970's. A chapter on collective bargaining in the last two editions also reflects attempts to keep the work current. However, this very important contribution to the field of textbook

literature does not pretend to advance the cause of theory. On pages 14 and 15 of the third edition it makes mention of the importance of theory development by saying, ". . . The practice of education administration, as well as of administration in general, is becoming more scientific because the body of pertinent knowledge is being increased by scientific study. . . ." It goes on to say that development of theory or theories of administration are bringing new ideas, knowledge, and understanding to the field. In Chapter 3, a treatment of systems theory as applied to administration is offered, and citations from works of Getzels, Coladarci, Etzioni, Parsons, Prethus, Gouldner, and other organizational theorists either in the social sciences or in education with social science leanings are made. This attempt at updating an essentially descriptive text to one which melts theory and description is successful in so far as it goes. Fortunately, the authors have modified their work but not essentially changed the primary thrust of description and limited expert opinion. It is no wonder the work has weathered the surges and fluctuations in education administration. It has subtly changed with the times and still furnishes a valuable service to the profession by furnishing one of the best overall pictures of administrative functions and processes today. The author thinks the optimum way in which to utilize *Educational Organization and Administration* is to team it with a theory-directed text. A bit expensive perhaps for the student but nonetheless a wider perspective can be presented to the learner. The classification for Morphet, Johns, and Reller would decidedly be in the middle category of a moderate synthesis between theory and tradition.

A work very close to the content and quality of *Educational Organization and Administration* is *Administration of Public Education* by Stephen Knezevich. This very widely used text emerged in 1984 in its fourth edition. It first appeared in 1962 and has been periodically updated by Knezevich. The content has been seemingly more consistent than that of Morphet, Johns, and Reller. It is more statistically oriented than any other of the 12 books reviewed and, of the middle category type books, is the most theory oriented. It especially in the third and fourth editions advances organizational theory found in sociology and public administration. Included are theory tools, their descriptions, and how they might be applied to solving educational problems. Leadership theory also emerges in the text in a very coherent manner easily understandable by a layperson, let alone a graduate student or practicing administrator.

Interestingly enough, Knezevich approaches from the standpoint of a moderate treatment of theory, then moving into a more descriptive treatment of the school organization and structure, and finally, into policy making and issues or challenges. This is very well organized and structured basic text and has much to recommend it to either the professor or the student who wishes to know something about administrative theory as well as the more practical aspects of schools. It is almost a perfect blend of theory and practicality. It most definitely shows the influence of theorists and social scientists both in and out of professional education circles. Also, it is probably the multi-edition text undergoing the fewest changes from edition to edition reviewed.

Another "standard" text, used in five editions, has been *The Organization and Control of American Schools* by Roald Campbell, Luvern L. Cunningham, Raphael O. Nystrand, Michael D. Usdan, and several other co-authors depending on the various editions. Each of the reviewed texts has some slight point of emphasis, and *The Organization and Control of American Schools* leans more toward a description and explanation of organs of governance than other texts. This book more than others focuses on issues found in education and advances some suggested ways in which to resolve or meet these challenges. The third, fourth, and fifth editions are updates but do not dramatically change the overall format of the work. In fact, only small changes could be found in a scanning of all five editions. The first edition appeared in 1965 and the most recent in 1985.

The use of theory is minimal in Campbell and Cunningham and appears only infrequently as on pages 240-243, when Egon Guba's model of internal administration is discussed along with several portrayals of graphs. Again, this book focused on control, legal and statistical descriptions of the governance process. In addition, extensive treatment is given to external change agent groups such as community, governmental agencies, and colleges. Also, the book furnishes interesting statistics on such groups as teachers and students.

In summarizing this work it might be said to be among the first in its field, policy development. Its strong emphasis on governance, educational client groups, and descriptions of how schools are governed more than administered is an excellent example of a beginning work in educational policy studies. Campbell and Cunningham perhaps unknowingly were branching off the mainstream of general

educational administration into a more specialized area. However, the influence of the social/behavioral sciences and theoretical base is not to be seen in this work, and it has to be classified as a traditionalist work just a bit removed from the mainstream of general textbook literature in the field.

The next reviewed work, *Educational Administration as a Social Process: Theory Research and Practice*, by Jacob Getzels, James Lipham, and Roald Campbell, first published in 1968, is the most radical departure from the mainstream of the literature up until 1968, and in some ways after that date to present. This is probably the first text in administration to strongly emphasize theory and social science research at the cost of not spending hundreds of pages describing the general educational enterprise and its myriad challenges and problems. This book was indeed a radical departure and probably was not used as an introductory text in many colleges and universities. Of its three authors it seems likely that Getzels and Lipham wrote most of the work. I would imagine that Getzels contributed most of the theoretical structures and Lipham contributed chapters dealing with subjects such as staff and board relationships. In this work, Roald Campbell does what few other text writers of this period were able to do, namely, make the transition from description to theory.

The work is structured much as might be expected of a theory text with a secondary emphasis on research and practice. The content of theory is discussed before moving on into a development of administrative theory as to how it might be applied to educational administration. Next, the most often cited part of the book is rendered in the form of Getzel's "nomothetic and idiographic dimensions" of administration. Subsequent chapters deal in great detail with the context of culture in administration, institutional expectations, roles, and how in conflict they become with personal needs. Truly, the book attempts to look at theory, the institution, the person, and how the three can be moved toward institutional as well as individual goals. A great deal of time is spent on role definition, conflict, and institutionalization. Sometimes the reader gains the feeling the book is really in the field of social psychology until the final chapters, when specific school oriented functions, roles, and problems are encountered.

Staff relations, roles of school boards, teacher organizations, and relations with the community are discussed, and

relevant research is cited which pertains to current issues in those areas, but again with a social science theory base. So to say the least, this book borrows heavily from the social and behavioral sciences and does not apologize. It shouldn't, as it truly is a pioneering work, a bit clumsy in places, hard to read in others, but in total a good effort to develop a theory of administration and put it to work in understanding the school institution. This does not mean the book is without fault. It most certainly should be criticized for some of its hard-to-read passages. It is certainly difficult to put into clear, concise English the theories of Talcott Parsons, but Getzels could perhaps have been a bit more helpful in this area. This book first reached the field in 1968 and followed the re-publication of Halpin's *Administrative Theory in Education* born in the 1957 Midwest Conference at the University of Chicago. Unfortunately, Getzels and Lipham were unable to have their book published within a year or two after the important "theory conferences" of the late 1950's. This would have surely brought more attention and use for their theory-based general text.

A second theory-based general administration text followed Getzels and Lipham in 1973--Thomas Sergiovanni and Fred Carver of the University of Illinois in their book entitled *The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration*. Coming five years after the Getzels and Lipham work, Sergiovanni and Carver had time to further synthesize and incorporate more theory and research from sociology and psychology into an educational context. This is not meant in a demeaning way, as their "borrowings" are most appropriate and valuable. The orientation of the book is decidedly behavioral and fits the trend of the time to promote an administrative emphasis in the schools to loosen bureaucratic structures and find ways in which staff, students, and parents could be treated in humane ways.

Interestingly, Sergiovanni and Carver also are concerned with what they call a "belief system" meaning values, attitudes, goals, and objectives. The first half of the book is primarily focused on the individual within the institution. Motivation, adjustment, satisfaction, and ways of decision making are certainly approached from the viewpoint of the social psychologists concerned with the health of a productive organization. McGregor, Maslow, and Herzberg, among other behavioral scientists, are borrowed from in a well organized manner. In brief, the authors attempt to use social/psychology research to explain contemporary situ-

ations and problems in school management, and also to reinforce what they think to be the best approaches to conflict resolution.

Also, in the first half of the book is a discussion of values and what might be said to be a discussion of a moral philosophy for the new school executive, who the authors feel should be a quasi-social/behavioral scientist. The authors probably seriously thought at the time administrators were not utilizing the benefits and contributions of management science current in the private sector. To say the least, they create a dichotomy by boldly stating the field should be a science and at the same time discussing subjects which might be classed in the terminology of "practical strategies." However, this is not a serious failing of the work, as it is difficult to differentiate between a proposed action based on assumption, theory, and hypothesis versus that of a common sense practice.

The second half of the book primarily deals with organizational aspects of management. The administrator is retitled "the school executive." His/her workplace, environment, subordinate relationships, and leadership style are all briefly discussed within the context of research findings and theoretical models of such scholars as Egon Guba, Jacob Getzels, and Andrew Halpin, among others. If this book is to be criticized, it is from the perspective that a synthesis of social psychology and management science transferred to educational leadership is not appropriate for a general text in educational administration.

Of the texts revieved, *The New School Executive* is among those with the fewest pages. It definitely fits in the category of a general text emphasizing a theory approach. It is basically a recapitulation of other works and is a compendium in exactly the opposite of the traditionalists' approach. It is an extension of Getzels and Lipham's *Educational Administration as a Social Process.*

Among the selected dozen texts for this paper is only one which can be classified as the "edited type." Most of the works containing a series of papers or monographs by a group of authors were for the most part rather disjointed, without a constant approach and purpose. However, William Monahan's *Theoretical Dimensions of Educational Administration* is interesting because it approaches the same task as Sergiovanni and Carver undertook but uses its authors in a different respect. Of the 11 contributors, several are

not educators. However, the book is very effective in identifying the main concerns of education needing the development of administrative theory. The content and scope of the work is impressive, the quality of the writings superb, and it is probably not among the best sellers of the group reviewed. And, of the reviewed works, this one fits most solidly into the theory category. It is really the only near 100% theory work which can also be called a general text in administration. Although I have to disagree with Monahan, who states in the preface that his book is an introductory text, it is a bit heavy for many lower-level graduate students. Among the contributors are Egon Guba, Andrew Halpin, James Anderson, Warren Bennis, B. Jean Hills, and Robert Nisbet. This is an interesting text which will not fall victim to being outdated. In many respects it is the "oddball" of the dozen and the most difficult to read along with Getzels and Lipham; nonetheless, Monahan had a clear idea as to the development of theory in regard to school organization and climate.

Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery in *Educational Administration: An Introduction* bring this review back to the traditionalist approach of description with a bit of expert opinion. This book, published in 1976, is in some respects a throwback to the old standards such as Morphet and Johns. Even though the authors claim a total integration of theory and practice for a general overview of administration, the reviewer simply cannot see more than several chapters which summarize leading schools of movement and thought in organizational theory. In addition, other chapters perform the same type of task with community, governance, district politics, collective bargaining. To be fair, the authors have taken traditionalist description and blended it with current social science theory. However, the format of identifying areas of normal school function and then seeking a relevant social/behavioral science theory to fit is not necessarily a true and honest picture. The reader might begin to believe that it would be more productive to dispense with the book and instead buy two books, one such as Morphet and Johns which provides the description of administrative functions and one by Peter Drucker which deals directly with organizations and management. Thus, the reader could make the adaptation to education and have the more in-depth benefit of two leaders in their respective fields of inquiry. As the middle category works go, this book is not the least bit unacceptable. The overall view of education and management theory is well presented but with the limitations encountered when in essence two actual books

are compressed into one. This work has not yet emerged in a second edition, which is somewhat surprising, as the reviewer would think this type of "new movement" compendium would be somewhat popular with professors of education administration in many programs which could be classified as middle of the road between theory and practice emphasis. At this point, the reviewer also has to admit that after 10 plus volumes the same recurring themes get a bit boring to read and reread.

In *Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice* by Wayne Hoy and Cecil Miskel is found perhaps the best integration of research findings and administrative theory. The authors very carefully weave research findings by Fred Fiedler, Amitai Etzioni, Sergiovanni, Herzberg, and others into how and why they are important to theory development subsequently leading to operational practice. Many graduate students might find the going difficult in some of the chapters, but overall the book does an excellent job in summarizing contemporary organizational and leadership theory and making suggestions as to the practical applications of those theories.

This book is without doubt one of the better theory oriented books while at the same time having something for the practitioner oriented student. However, it is clearly in the theory group and hopefully a new edition will simplify several chapters and expand on the aspect of practical application in a field setting.

Clarence Newell's work entitled *Human Behavior in Educational Administration* might be questioned by some as not being among the leaders in textbook literature in educational administration. However, it is among the most recent of the general type of text appearing in its first edition. It is included because it exemplifies an emerging pattern of multiple texts for a general course in administration. It is not large (261 pages) and attempts to focus directly on human behavior in the school organization. It too repeats or recapitulates the leading theorists and researchers such as Getzels but does so fairly and without losing context. The strongest feature of the book is its treatment of the communication process. In some respects this book is the one of the selected 12 which attempts to provide the reader with some actual information tied very closely to implementation of social science theory. In some ways it approaches a "how to do" type of work. Its weak points are that it is too superficial and brief and does not cover the

entire spectrum as many other texts do. Its focus is rather narrow and as a dollar for dollar investment cannot stand up to other general texts. However, it is a good supplementary text when an instructor wishes in effect to have two different books serve the purpose of one general text. An argument might be advanced that taking into consideration today's complex technological world in which the school finds itself, coupled with the advancement of knowledge in the social/behavioral sciences, one single work cannot adequately furnish an overall picture of school management. It is for this reason that *Human Behavior in Educational Administration* is included in the reviewed group. Its thrust is a bit different and narrower than others on the list.

The last book reviewed is *Educational Administration and Organizational Behavior* by E. Mark Hanson. This is a very interesting text from the standpoint of content and organization. It is fairly recent (1979) and has been used in many programs across the country. This is definitely the work of a "New Movement" administrator/social psychologist and reflects totally the abandonment of the traditionist use of description and opinion. In some respects it is amazing as in no other text is case study used to the degree it is in *Educational Administration and Organizational Behavior*. The work is terribly efficient as the author in one chapter goes through, in a rapid manner, classical theory, contingency theory of leadership, path-goal theory of leadership, open systems theory of leadership, etc. In brief, he says a lot in a minimum number of pages. Surprisingly, of the 12 reviewed books he is the only author devoting a chapter to the study of educational change as it is usually referred to in an academic sense. For an instructor to cover the content of this book in 16 to 18 class meetings over a semester is a heavy task. The merit of the book is the amount of theory and research covered which relates directly to the administrative function. The demerits are even though it is a general overview, it does not provide enough depth to always give a clear, concise picture of the topic in question. Thus, we have the age-old problem of general textbooks, of having to be general and specific at the same time in order to accomplish the end result of imparting that which should really be learned by the student. Perhaps Hanson is faced with the same problem any author of a general text in educational administration is faced with today, namely, the amount of knowledge and research as expanded to the degree where it is most difficult to select which is most important. A dilemma indeed to write a general text in

a world and professional field which are becoming increasingly specialized. Hanson's attempt at performing this impossible task is commendable, and the book deserves use by instructors wishing to present to their students an overview of how the social sciences impact administration of schools in today's world.

To conclude this paper/review without a parting comment about the excellent texts presently found in specialized areas would be remiss. Within the specialized administrative functions and topic areas such as personnel, supervision, community relations, and law are many excellent texts. Many of these texts are general texts for those specialized areas. For instance, Gordon McCloskey's *Education and Public Understanding* was for many years *the* work in community relations used around the nation. However, it too was eclipsed in the 1960's because of application of the social sciences to that specialized area, especially, books which discussed the culture groups found in various communities. The field of school law has been replete with casebooks which have been periodically updated as new developments have occurred in the field. Perhaps in supervision has there been the most significant change in direction. It appears that almost every 10 years works in supervision make significant changes in content. Personnel administration has been dominated for years by William Castetter's *The Personnel Function in Educational Administration*, now in its third edition.

Other excellent texts are available in other specialized areas including theory. Sometimes it is difficult to discern between a specialized text and a scholarly work, as many of the specialized texts contain various pieces of original research reporting.

In summary, after review of the probable leading texts in general education administration, it is apparent that one single volume under 400 pages simply cannot achieve the multiple task of encompassing the total spectrum of description, explanation, and prediction of school management. Tremendously large or multi-volume texts probably would be the answer, but the possibility of a publisher taking on a two- or three-volume general text in school administration is questionable. Also, it is probable that no such manuscript has been or is being produced. Some aspiring set of writers should embark on such a mission!

NOTES TO CHAPTER 5

1. Jesse B. Sears, *The Nature of the Administrative Process* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950), p. 13.

2. Paul Mort, *Principles of School Administration* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957), pp. 27-28.

3. Daniel Griffiths, *Administrative Theory* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959), p. 51.

4. Ibid., pp. 51-54.

5. Andrew Halpin, "Development of Theory," in *Administrative Theory in Education*, p. 3.

6. Ibid., p. 6.

7. Roald Campbell, "Peculiarities in Educational Administration," in *Administrative Theory in Education*, p. 71.

8. Miller, Madden, and Kincheloe, *The Public Administration of School Systems* (2nd ed.), 1968, pp. v, vi.

9. Grieder, Pierce, and Jordan, *Public School Administration* (3rd ed.), p. 139.

Chapter 6

An Overview: School Administration Texts 1820–1985

Thomas E. Glass

What might be characterized as being the first textbook in educational administration is difficult to identify, as school teaching and school administering were really one and the same. The period of Common Schools discussed in the first paper of this monograph begins its journey through the literature by setting the baseline date of 1820. Prior to that time schools were "non-professional" in terms of being administered by laypersons who directed teachers and the educational program without the assistance of an intermediary school administrator. The early literature in American education is replete with the character of the "schoolmaster" furnishing the necessary supervision to students. However, the fact of the "schoolmaster" and other teachers is always important, if present, under school supervision. Thus, the role of a school administrator really did not exist except in the largest of common school systems until the turn of the century.

Perhaps the theme of American education in the nineteenth century was the "Ascendancy of the Common School." Since the first settlements in the "New World," education had been dominated by religious dogma and groups. In fact, "education" was religious education and the curriculum reflected what one needed to know to be a good Christian, usually a Protestant. Horace Mann, among others, began in about the fourth decade of the century a quasi-religious movement known as the common school movement. Perhaps the best piece of literature which chronicles this event is found in *Managers of Virtue: Public School Leadership in America, 1920-1980*, by David Tyack and Elisabeth Hansot, an

excellent work, published in 1981. Tyack and Hansot furnish probably the best overview of the development of American educational leadership available in print today. However, the early authors such as Samuel Dutton and William Payne were primarily interested in providing schoolmasters and perhaps lay board members some guidelines to school-keeping. These guidelines were basically "how to do it" type manuals long on advice, short on theory and empirical fact. In addition, most of the early authors were almost obsessively interested in promoting and maintaining the strict moral upbringing required by the Anglo-Saxon Protestant work ethic, so much a part of life in America at that time.[1]

As might be expected, schools and school management by the turn of the century began to reflect aspects of the growing urbanism of the nation. Cities such as New York, Chicago, Detroit, and Cleveland suddenly found themselves with huge school systems costing the taxpayers millions of dollars to operate. And, most importantly, some type of centralization including efficient management was necessary--a major factor in the development of the concept of a general superintendent of schools. The management of a school district by one person did not substantially evolve suddenly or without conflict. The management of large school districts for many years was the domain of two persons, the superintendent and the business manager, each selected independent of the other by the elected or appointed school board. Samuel Dutton and David Snedden in *The Administration of Public Education in the United States*, first published in 1908, provide a picture of the times by picturing the superintendent as being a "moral" leader and a protector of what is "virtue" in the community, the business manager being of course the person entrusted for that important commodity of district finances.[2] This is not to say that Dutton and Snedden agreed with the approach; in fact, these two authors evolve into the beginnings of modern educational science as later espoused by Strayer and Thorndike.

On the other hand, Dutton, who probably was the leading author of texts at the turn of the century in 1903, had already produced an extensive compendium of order, strictness, and a day-to-day routine of running a school or schools. Another representative influence in the texts of this period before the First World War is William Chancellor, who most decidedly tells the nation's schoolmasters what is moral and what is not moral and what should be done away with in order to save the souls of the students. How-

ever, to Chancellor's credit, he does foreshadow the beginnings of the development of a child-centered school and the future educational programs to flower under John Dewey. In brief, the period between 1820 and 1914 was one where order and morals are strongly emphasized in a relentless number of pages. Very little theory and science is found as the common school movement became a reality in the United States. In many respects secular religion was the theme of the day with a dash of common sense, order, and procedure. In general, the texts reviewed in the first paper of the monograph ably reflect what was happening in the common school movement and society in general. Whether or not they were significant influences in the development of the "school district" concept is debatable; however, they must have had some degree of influence on the leadership of the day.

This paper indeed raises one of the most important questions generated by this monograph: have the general texts influenced the development of the profession and schools, or have contemporary social and intellectual forces influenced the texts? Or has there been a mixture of the two? For the period of 1820 to 1914 a guess would be that the latter was occurring, especially after the turn of the century.

The onset of the First World War brought many changes to American society including the perceived need for more and better educational systems. The needs of wartime industry, research, and adjustment to developing technology, perhaps along with a developing secular society, furnished the setting for changes in school curriculum and management. Textbooks in education became more specialized, including those directly addressing the management of schools. One of the most interesting books in education of the time was published a bit before the war and in many later editions. Paul Monroe's *Cyclopaedia of Education* provided the reader with just about "everything" a person needed to know about education. For our purposes, Monroe mentions that in 1910, 348 new titles had emerged in education. Many of the 348 were in educational administration, which also at the time included supervision.[3] Importantly, the texts of the period began the quest for empirical knowledge as the basis of managing schools and school programs. Perhaps, this is also a very subtle movement for removing religion from the schools. Surely, the profession was in the process of being "professionalized" and the texts do denote a decline in moral teaching and emphasis on religious values.

The creation of departments of educational administration in colleges and universities such as Teachers College, Columbia University, began the movement toward an empirical base for administration during this period. Many students of these early departments, with their professors as mentors, gained the superintendencies of large districts throughout the nation and began to practice the empirically oriented wisdom gained in higher education.[4] In addition to the increasing numbers of titles emanating from institutions such as Teachers College, nationwide associations such as the National Education Association also began to perform a research as well as publication function for writers and professors of administration. George Strayer and Robert Thorndike represented in their books the prevailing emphasis of the period on empiricism in administration. Thorndike in "connectionism" and Strayer's "surveys" were landmark events of educational administration during the period. Despite the prolific output of these two Teachers College professors, Ellwood Cubberley of Stanford probably is the dominant author of texts of the period. Many of Thorndike's and Strayer's books might be classified as scholarly works and not entirely suitable for use as general texts. Not so for Cubberley, as he moved from *Changing Conceptions of Education* in 1909 to a series of titles ending in 1934 which influenced several generations of students in general administration classes around the nation. Cubberley is not only descriptive but is also most assuredly authoritative.[5] His books were readable and set the tone of educational administration programs in many institutions across the country.

The textbooks emanating from the university programs, authored by professors and occasionally superintendents in the field, probably were very influential on how schools were administered if not governed. The prolific output of the abstracted empiricists such as Strayer and Thorndike produced hundreds of thousands of statistics which were used to direct administrators in how to perform their daily tasks. Science became supreme, at least to the point of its development at that time. And science, at the time, was the "scientific management" of Taylor and Fayol which had a significant impact on the professors of education and their students, the superintendents.

A last note on the period was the development of a series of mentorships which the university professors sponsored and utilized in placing their students in superintendencies across the nation. This system is well documented in *Managers of Virtue* and probably more than anything else

insured the influence of textbooks in administration written by the sponsoring professor.[6] However, the increasing impact of the world of technology was solidly reflected in the texts of the period. The authors were creatures of their environment.

Even though the Great Depression lasted only 10 years, a clear theme is seen of the 1934 to 1945 period in education administration as being a struggle between the dualism of conventional wisdom of the past and emerging concepts of the role of the school in society. Briefly, this was a question of choice between maintaining the society of the past via the school enterprise or changing society by use of education as a change agent.

During this period, investigations were conducted as to the administration of the various areas of the management function. Classroom sizes, physical spaces, arrangement, certification, and teacher training were among the many detailed tasks looked at by the general texts which emerged from the pens of professors. In essence, the early pioneering professors had planted their seeds, and the resultant crop was a group of professors across the nation in educational administration programs who began to publish. Noteworthy is the appearance of textbooks in the specialized areas of administration. However, the general trend of textbooks containing a great amount of conventional wisdom obtained from surveys and "good practice" continued to dominate the titles coming onto the expanding market in graduate education administration. Administration was growing both in numbers of administrators and in special roles.

The educational enterprise was growing, as was the general population and its expectations for the schools to furnish basic skills, technical training, and a means for upward social mobility. The Great Depression furnished a tailored stage for the re-examination of the basic purpose of education by such humanists as John Dewey, William Kilpatrick, and George S. Counts.[6] The state of the human condition during the Depression had shocked many academics, especially those in education. The previous god of scientific management with accompanying technology and production had its back broken by Black Friday on the New York Stock Exchange. If education was not to be carried on as a quasi-corporate production model, what path should it take? What was to be the future role or mission of the schools? Texts began to emerge in the middle 1930's which gave a hint. In Jesse Newlon's *Educational Administration as a Social*

Policy, it is stated the four basic purposes of schools should be (1) transmission of the culture, (2) education for citizenship, (3) social control, and (4) vocational efficiency. Newlon went on to say that education had always been focused on a static society instead of merging and emerging purposes and needs.[7]

Thus, the first of the social reformist writers of the educational world came onto the scene. This type of writer was to become quite commonplace in the next 40 years, cresting in the reform-dominated 1960's and early 1970's. Many times they attempted general textbooks with the purpose in mind of overturning all of the old themes and platitudes of desired and good "principles" of educational administration. However, their attempts at texts rarely if ever survived more than a first printing and limited distribution in the classrooms of graduate schools. Simply put, most professors of educational administration were former schoolmen in that static society and in no way could be seen as social or political reformers of a very liberal persuasion. This has been the case throughout history. Professors of educational administration have been among the leaders in their institutions of preserving the historical purpose of higher education in America, namely, being the maintainer of the status quo.

When in the 1940's many writers of educational administration texts called for a reformulation of the purposes of public education, they were not advocating revolution or substantial reform. Instead, they generally desired for institutions to modify their orientations from that of strict authoritarianism to one of democratic cooperation between teachers and administrators. In fact, the democratic theme of shared governance emerges time and again.

To return briefly to the dualism problem mentioned earlier, the field of texts had been and was still dominated by works which contained many chapters about buildings, playgrounds, personnel records, schedules, and all of the internal management tasks associated with running a school. Average practice in the average school and school district was the *modus operandi*. Seldom do the general text authors discuss to what purpose are administrators to administrate the schools. "Don't think about it, do it" is the prescription outlined in the standard 500 pages of the day. However, a few authors were bringing up the sticky problem of purpose squarely in the first chapters of their texts.

Democracy in School Administration by Koopman, Miel, and Misner is the bellringer of this group, and the influence of Dewey can be seen in their view of the individual and society.[7] In sum, by the end of this period the traditional writers no longer thought of schools as isolated bastions of learning and moral teachings necessary for contemporary virtue. The impact of the expanding fields of sociology, anthropology, political science, and psychology were beginning their soon-to-be substantial impact on education in its various facets.

After the Second World War, textbook writers again returned to themes of the social process of the school coupled with "principles" of good administrative practice. The nation as well as public education was interested in just what end purpose was to result after 12 years of formal schooling. Due to the tremendous social upheaval caused by the war, democracy emerged as a dominant theme. What was democratic and what was "American" were important and were to be emphasized, held onto, and increased in order to keep America safe for democracy, a concept for which millions had recently perished in the horrors of war. A cornerstone of democracy was the local community, and during this period writers such as Paul Mort and Jesse Sears did much to promote the goodness of the school in meeting identified needs of the community and, perhaps more importantly, promoted the desirability of the local school board. The local board was the true and best representative of the people in a democracy which featured schools for all regardless of race, religion, creed, or national origin. Text after text dedicated chapters to how a philosophy of education should be adopted by each district with the administrator and the board in leadership roles. Usually, a very strong hint is given that democracy should be well represented in the lexicon of each philosophy and in the policy manual of the district. Then our text writers enter into discussions of the intricacies of each administrative function to be performed. Expert advice is given in the specific, along with "expert" principles based on best practice as magically discovered in solid empirical studies of past years by the intellectual godfathers of educational administration. The textbooks during this era perhaps more than any other reflect the social and political turmoil and trends of the era in study. They strive for direction based on common sense, patriotism, structure, and stability. In many, there is a feeling that education is embarking on a voyage into a new world, fearfully, and perhaps not promising in all respects.

Seemingly, most of the authors of this period, 1946-55, were older men, as their names appear on many titles throughout the previous 20 years.

The path to the future begins to form in the middle 1950's as writers such as Daniel Griffiths and Andrew Halpin advocated the development of an administrative theory in opposition to the factualism of the present and past. This was the key to speak for future developments which were greatly assisted by the rapidly increasing programs in school administration fueled by the baby boom. The numbers of professors of administration dramatically increased as well as the numbers of sociologists and psychologists who were developing their disciplines with the help of theories, models, and methodologies which of course were later augmented by computers. With the additions of manpower, funding, and interest, change in education and other social service types of endeavors was inevitable, school administration not excepted. By the middle 1960's, theory chapters begin to be in evidence in many a general text. In fact, in 1968, a text with a strong theoretical orientation appeared out of the University of Chicago, authored by Jacob Getzels, James Lipham, and Roald Campbell. This text strongly emphasized theory and borrowed research findings from the social and behavioral sciences. It definitely was a new direction and what authors such as Halpin would later refer to as the "New Movement."[8] This did not mean the old movement was dead and buried. Far from it, as general texts continued to appear containing large amounts of descriptive material and expert opinion. The "principles" survived regardless of the emergence of theory. The new movement has not been totally successful in displacing descriptive studies as well it should not be, as both have their respective value to the profession. Interestingly, both types of works have improved over the past several decades and are more scholarly and complete. They in effect present a dilemma, as most instructors can see a need for what each offers but cannot use both as a text adoption. From a casual survey of instructors teaching courses in which a general text is required, not one respondent felt one single text was adequate to meet the reading needs of the students. Thus, many courses are now being taught with two text adoptions. What is needed is a multi-volume "super" text or a good descriptive or theoretical research text augmented by a good paperback in either field of emphasis.

The field of study of general textbooks in educational administration is interesting, as the world of education can

be seen and predicted by the flow of the chapters being read by the neophytes of the profession.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 6

1. David Tyack and Elisabeth Hansot, *Managers of Virtue: Public School Leadership in America*, 1820-1980 (New York: Basic Books, 1982), pp. 7-10.

2. Samuel T. Dutton, *School Management* (New York: Scribner's, 1909), pp. 3-10.

3. Paul Monroe, ed., *A Cyclopaedia of Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1911).

4. Tyack and Hansot, *Managers of Virtue*, pp. 130-135.

5. Ellwood Cubberley, *Readings in Public Education in the United States* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1934).

6. Tyack and Hansot, *Managers of Virtue*, pp. 133-134.

7. G. Robert Koopman, Alice Miel, and Paul J. Misner, *Democracy in School Administration* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1943), p. v.

8. Andrew Halpin, *Theory and Research in Administration* (New York: Macmillan, 1966).

"SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION IS BORN"
1820 to 1914

Themes

Each profession must grow through a series of developmental stages to maturity. This has been the case with school administration, which began to develop and grow alongside the common school movement in the United States. As the numbers of common schools evolved into multi-school districts, the need for men to manage the morals and education of the young was perceived by the lay governance boards as being needed and desirable. Schoolmasters became administrators. The historical practice of learning totally through modeling and apprenticeship was not possible, and a body of textbook literature slowly began to be used directly or indirectly to train men who would be managing the schools.

The dominant theme of this early literature was the cookbook approach. As there were not a great many formal classroom lecture halls in evidence, most of the books were initially written so that a man could stay at home, and in front of his hearth read how to run a school. The early texts reflected the times as they emphasized the religious dominance of three leading Protestant groups in the common school movement. First, the administrator was to insure the morals of students and staff. Second, he needed to know what the best and wisest practices were in operating his school or district. Common sense prevailed for this group of men (there were few women administrators). The leading texts of the period were:

Chancellor, William E. *Our Schools: Their Administration and Supervision.* Boston: Heath, 1915.

Chancellor, William E. *A Theory of Motives, Ideals, and Values in Education.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1907.

Dutton, Samuel T. *School Management.* First published in 1903. New York: Scribner's, 1909.

Dutton, Samuel T., and David Snedden. *The Administration of Public Education in the United States.* New York: Macmillan, 1908.

Hall, Samuel R. *Lectures on School-keeping.* Boston: Richardson, Lord, and Holbrook, 1829. Republished by Arno Press.

Hall, Samuel R. *Lectures to Female Teachers on School-keeping.* Boston: Richardson, Lord, and Holbrook, 1832. Republished by Arno Press.

National Education Association. *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses, 1895,* pp. 357-397.

Page, David P. *Theory and Practice of Teaching.* Originally published in 1847. New edition, edited and enlarged by W. H. Payne. New York and Chicago: A. S. Barnes, 1885.

Payne, William H. *Chapters on School Supervision.* Cincinnati and New York: Wilson, Hinkle and Co., 1875.

Payne, William H. *Education of Teachers.* Richmond, Va.: B. F. Johnson, 1901.

Search, Preston W. *An Ideal School.* New York: Appleton, 1901.

THE CONTEMPORARY SCIENCE PERIOD
1915 to 1933

Themes

School administration had become a profession by the beginning of the First World War. Specialization in administration had begun to develop and would be prevalent as the school systems were affected by the increase of scientific management utilized for war production. Textbook writers were forced to melt their previous common sense-tempered pseudo-religious orientations into the contemporary force of scientific management. The era of empiricism had arrived as vividly portrayed in the numerous school studies conducted across the nation by the new group on the scene, namely, the professors of educational administration. From the mass of data generated by the studies, lists of "principles" were developed to be passed on to practicing administrators as the way in which to reach the goal of administration; "what ought to be," and, "what ought to be" the opinion of the experts in the field, such as the professors. Tremendous emphasis was present in the field to leave management to the experts and not in the hands of the lay boards. Leading textbooks of the period were:

Almack, John C., and James F. Bursch. *The Administration of Consolidated and Village Schools.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1925.

Ayer, Fred C., and A. S. Barr. *The Organization of Supervision.* New York: Appleton, 1928.

Barnes, Ina G. *Rural School Management.* New York: Macmillan, 1929.

Carney, Mabel. *Country Life and the Country School.* Chicago: Row and Peterson, 1912.

Chancellor, William E. *Our Schools, Their Administration and Supervision.* Boston: Heath, 1904.

Cubberley, Ellwood P. *Public School Administration.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1916.

Cubberley, Ellwood P. *State School Administration: A Textbook of Principles.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1927.

Culter, Horace M., and Julia M. Stone. *The Rural School: Its Methods and Management.* New York: Silver Burdett, 1913.

Hanus, Paul. *School Administration and School Reports.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1920.

Hanus, Paul. *School Efficiency: A Constructive Study Applied to New York City.* Yonkers, N.Y.: World Book Co., 1913.

Maxwell, William N. *A Quarter Century of Public School Development.* New York: American Book Co., 1912.

Monroe, Paul (ed.). *A Cyclopaedia of Education.* New York: Macmillan, 1911.

Sears, Jesse B. *The School Survey: A Textbook on the Use of School Surveying in the Administration of Public Schools.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1925.

Strayer, George D., and N. L. Engelhardt. *Problems in Educational Administration.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1925.

Strayer, George D., and Edward L. Thorndike. *Educational Administration: Quantitative Studies.* New York: Macmillan, 1913.

Webster, Oscar F. *Problems in Public School Administration.* New York: Century, 1930.

COMMON SENSE TO CONCEPTS
1934 to 1945

Themes

The Great Depression created an upheaval in America which was also felt in education and reflected in the textbooks on administration. The almost total belief in scientific management and science came to be questioned by a new group of humanists. Textbooks began to ask administrators what the role of the school should be in a democratic society. What was the goal of school in education of children? Common sense principles were insufficient for many text writers of this period. How the school could be managed to develop and shape the society became an increasing theme. Cooperation, participation, and democracy appear throughout the period, as writers responded to the teachings of such educators as John Dewey and George Counts to look closely at the purpose of the school and its role in the society of tomorrow. Perhaps this period is best characterized as being one of self-examination. Leading texts of the period for the Depression Era were:

Brown, Edwin J. *Secondary School Administration.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1938.

Cocking, Walter C., and Kenneth R. Williams. *The Education of School Administrators.* Washington: American Council on Education, 1940.

Edwards, Newton, and Herman G. Richey. *The School in the American Social Order.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1947.

Jaggers, Richard E. *Administering the County School System.* New York: American Book Co., 1934.

Koopman, G. Robert, Alice Miel, and Paul J. Misner. *Democracy in School Administration.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1943.

Koos, Leonard V., James M. Hughes, Percival W. Hudson, and William C. Reavis. *Administering the Secondary School.* New York: American Book Co., 1940.

Newlon, Jesse H. *Educational Administration as Social Policy.* New York: Scribner's, 1934.

Reavis, William C. *Administrative Adjustments Required by Socio-Economic Change.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941.

Reavis, William C. *Critical Issues in Educational Administration.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Weber, Samuel E. *Cooperative Administration and Supervision of the Teaching Personnel.* New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1937.

Witham, Ernest C. *Problem Studies in School Administration.* New York: Prentice-Hall, 1936.

AN ERA OF PROPAGANDA AND RHETORIC
1946 to 1955

Themes

The dominant themes in the texts of this relatively short period of time were democracy and community. Democracy prevailed in reaction to the concluded World War, which had threatened the foundations of the democratic nations of the world. Democracy as it appears in curriculum texts as well as administration texts oftentimes takes on the tone of a religion. Perhaps this attitude was a contributing cause to McCarthyism. School administrators were directed by the texts to adopt democratic principles in the running of schools. Parents, teachers, students, and anyone else in reach was to be consulted for participation in school decisions. This was true democracy and true Americanism.

Many texts also emphasize the importance of the community and the local school board, its representative. The writers perceive a changing America but really don't know where it is going or whether they wish to stop it from its natural course. In brief, the numbers of administrators being trained was increasing to meet the needs of the inflated enrollments of schools caused by the post-war baby boom. Most texts relied on already developed "principles" of administration and a good common sense approach. This was the approved path to be a competent administrator. This is very little indication that a quest for the development of administrative theory was just a few years away from fruition. Leading texts of the post-war era are:

Elsbree, Willard, and Harold J. McNally. *Elementary School Administration and Supervision.* New York: American Book Co., 1951.

Fox, James H., and others. *School Administration, Principles and Procedures.* New York: Prentice-Hall, 1949.

Hagman, Harlan L. *The Administration of American Public Schools.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951.

Huggett, Albert J. *Practical School Administration.* Champaign, Ill.: Garrard Press, 1950.

Moehlman, Arthur B. *School Administration.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.

Mort, Paul R. *Principles of School Administration: A Synthesis of Basic Concepts.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1946.

Pittenger, Benjamin R. *Local Public School Administration.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951.

Reeder, Ward G. *The Fundamentals of Public School Administration* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan, 1951.

Sears, Jesse B. *The Nature of the Administrative Process.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

Sears, Jesse B. *Public School Administration.* New York: Ronald, 1947.

Yauch, Wilbur A. *Improving Human Relations in School Administration.* New York: Harper, 1949.

FACTUALISM TO THEORY TO SCIENCE
1955 to 1985

Themes

The prevailing themes of this 30-year period are the development of administration theory and adoption of research, theory, and methodologies from the social/behavioral sciences. The beginning years of the period saw the struggle for development and acceptance of administrative theory. Application of social/behavioral science research and tools was a second dominant theme. Even though the period is generally perceived by the ascendance and dominance of the social sciences in educational administration, that is not totally reflected in the general type text. Many general texts were written and re-written to remain descriptive tomes of expert opinion as well as description of administrative functions and accompanying sets of problems/challenges.

The first texts based heavily on the newly developed administrative theory, largely of borrowings from social science, appeared on the market and influenced later works which either copied the theory influenced or tried to blend it together with the more traditional approaches. This was an interesting period in textbook production, ending in a state of incompleteness for both groups. A collective opinion that no one single in-print text is adequate to meet the needs of today's general course in administration probably approximates the truth of the issue. So, the profession is back to 1820 when there were no suitable texts, a true dilemma.

Campbell, Roald, and others. *Organizations and Control of American Schools* (5th ed.). Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1985.

Carver, Fred D., and Thomas J. Sergiovanni. *The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration.* New York: Mead and Dodd, 1973.

Charters, W. W., Jr. *Perspectives on Educational Administration and the Behavioral Sciences.* Eugene: University of Oregon Press, 1965.

Erickson, Don. *Educational Organization and Administration.* Berkeley, Cal.: McCutchan, 1977.

Getzels, Jacob, James Lipham, and Roald Campbell. *Educational Administration as Social Process.* New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Goldhammer, Keith, and others. *Issues and Problems in Contemporary Educational Administration.* Eugene: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1967.

Grieder, Calvin, and others. *Public School Administration* (3rd ed.) New York: Ronald, 1961.

Hanson, Mark. *Educational Administration and Organizational Behavior.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1979.

Kimbrough, R. B., and M. Y. Nunnery. *Educational Administration: An Introduction.* New York: Macmillan, 1976.

Knezevich, Stephen J. *Administration of Public Education* (4th ed.). New York: Harper & Row, 1984.

Miller, Van, and others. *The Public Administration of American School Systems* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan, 1972.

Monahan, William (ed.). *Theoretical Dimensions of Educational Administration.* New York: Macmillan, 1975.

Morphet, Edgar, and others. *Educational Organization and Administration* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1984.

Nevell, Clarence. *Human Behavior in Educational Administration.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1978.

Silver, Paula. *Educational Administration: Theoretical Perspectives on Practice and Research.* New York: Harper & Row, 1983.